

county of Merrick and State of Nebraska, in place of Lucius G. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

George M. Prentice, to be postmaster at Fairfield, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in place of George M. Prentice. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1902.

George W. Jackson, to be postmaster at Fairmont, in the county of Fillmore and State of Nebraska, in place of George W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Festus Lloyd, to be postmaster at Ebensburg, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Festus Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1902.

Isador Sobel, to be postmaster at Erie, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Isador Sobel. Incumbent's commission expires March 15, 1902.

Robert S. Brown, to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, in the county of Rutherford and State of Tennessee, in place of Robert S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1902.

Peter J. Clarke, to be postmaster at Pulaski, in the county of Giles and State of Tennessee, in place of Peter J. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

William M. O'Leary, to be postmaster at Dallas, in the county of Dallas and State of Texas, in place of William M. O'Leary. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

Fred G. Haskins, to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Addison and State of Vermont, in place of Fred G. Haskins. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

Charles P. Nair, to be postmaster at Clifton Forge, in the county of Allegheny and State of Virginia, in place of Charles P. Nair. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

Samuel H. Hoge, to be postmaster at Roanoke, in the county of Roanoke and State of Virginia, in place of Samuel H. Hoge. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

K. P. Allen, to be postmaster at Pullman, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in place of Alfred A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

James F. McCaskey, to be postmaster at New Martinsville, in the county of Wetzel and State of West Virginia, in place of James F. McCaskey. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

James P. Baker, to be postmaster at Shell Lake, in the county of Washburn and State of Wisconsin, in place of James P. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1902.

George E. Weatherby, jr., to be postmaster at Shullsburg, in the county of Lafayette and State of Wisconsin, in place of George E. Weatherby, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1902.

William F. Brittain, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Sheridan and State of Wyoming, in place of William F. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1901.

Edwin F. Blodgett, to be postmaster at Atlanta, in the county of Fulton and State of Georgia, in place of William H. Smyth, deceased.

Albert R. Maginnis, to be postmaster at Abingdon, in the county of Knox and State of Illinois, in place of John W. Maginnis, deceased.

Evan H. Ferree, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana, in place of James L. Bradford, resigned.

#### WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn March 10, 1902.*

Charles P. Harder, to be postmaster at Danville, in the State of Pennsylvania.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10, 1902.*

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### Cavalry Arm.

Christian A. Bach, at large, late first lieutenant, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers (now second lieutenant, Twentieth Infantry, United States Army), to be first lieutenant, February 2, 1901.

Joseph L. Sanford, of Virginia, contract surgeon, United States Army, to be assistant surgeon, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, March 1, 1902.

Edward T. Gibson, of Minnesota, contract surgeon, United States Army, to be assistant surgeon, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, February 28, 1902.

##### POSTMASTERS.

Charles S. Robinson, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Mercer and State of New Jersey.

Chester A. Burt, to be postmaster at Helmetta, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey.

Anna Callahan, to be postmaster at Casselton, in the county of Cass and State of North Dakota.

William F. Gruetzmacher, to be postmaster at Watertown, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

William H. Underwood, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles Hidden, to be postmaster at Sun Prairie, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin.

Elizabeth W. Haseltine, to be postmaster at Swissvale, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles Koch, to be postmaster at Pitcairn, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Peter W. MacKenzie, to be postmaster at Poynette, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin.

I. Newton Taylor, to be postmaster at Mount Union, in the county of Huntingdon and State of Pennsylvania.

Edward C. Dithrich, to be postmaster at Coraopolis, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 10, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

##### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURTON. I am directed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to report a bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and to ask that the same be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. I desire to give notice that I shall seek to bring up this bill for consideration immediately after the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I reserve all points of order on this bill.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved.

The bill was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

##### CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT. I desire to call up House bill 11471, the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, which comes back from the Senate with amendments. I ask that the House nonconcur in the amendments and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill be nonconcurring in and a conference with the Senate requested. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether the minority members of the committee have consented to this action?

Mr. HITT. I have not been able to consult with them. The committee has been unanimous on the bill from the beginning. We have taken no steps to which all our members did not agree. I see that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], a member of the committee, is present.

Mr. CLARK. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and the order is made as requested by the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HITT, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ADAMS, and the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. DINSMORE.

##### MINORITY VIEWS ON BILL FOR IRRIGATION OF ARID LANDS.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, late on Saturday last the majority of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands filed their report on the bill (H. R. 9676) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands. I did not know that the report was to be filed at that time. I ask leave now to file the views of the minority of the committee, that they may be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] asks to file the views of a minority of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, and that they be printed.

There was no objection.

##### BRIDGE ACROSS NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 10305.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 14 of the act approved June 29, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across Niagara River," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows: "Sec. 14. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year from the date of the passage of this act and completed by June 30, 1905."

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

*Provided,* That the said act of June 29, 1898, shall continue in full force and effect, as herein modified, notwithstanding said structure was not completed before June 29, 1901."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What is the object of extending the time as fixed in the original bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This bill simply extends for one year the time fixed for the construction of the bridge. A bill similar to this has passed the House twice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This bill does not in any way interfere with that provision of the original bill by which the Government retains the right to amend?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is not interfered with at all. This bill simply extends the time one year.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS EAST ST. ANDREWS BAY, FLORIDA.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9332, to authorize the Dothan, Hartford and Florida Railway Company to construct a bridge across East St. Andrews Bay, navigable water, at a point about 1 mile east of Farmdale, in the State of Florida.

The bill was read. It provides—

that the Dothan, Hartford and Florida Railway Company be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain and operate a bridge across East St. Andrews Bay, navigable water, in the State of Florida; said bridge to be located about 1 mile east of Farmdale, in said State.

That said bridge shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CLAYTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### STATUE OF BENJAMIN F. STEPHENSON.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I will send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That permission be, and is hereby, granted the Grand Army of the Republic of the United States of America to erect a statue to the memory and honor of the late Benjamin F. Stephenson, founder of the Grand Army of the Republic of the United States of America, on one of the public reservations of the city of Washington, D. C., to be designated by the Secretary of War, the Joint Committee on the Library, the superintendent of public buildings and grounds, and the committee of the Grand Army of the Republic appointed by it for that purpose: *Provided,* That the statue, with pedestal, shall cost not less than \$15,000, and that it shall be presented to the people of the United States by the said Grand Army of the Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House joint resolution 61?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is a settled fact in history that the gentleman named in the resolution is the founder of the Grand Army of the Republic?

Mr. McCLEARY. In reply, I would say that the request comes from the officials of the Grand Army of the Republic, and if there is any doubt about it, they ought to be the final authority, or at least the best authority obtainable, far better than I would be.

Mr. PAYNE. I know of one or two other gentlemen—soldiers—who have claimed the distinction of that honor.

Mr. McCLEARY. Historical matters are often matters of controversy, and we can only settle them according to the best authority available. This is the action of the Grand Army of the Republic in its official capacity, and they undoubtedly have considered the testimony, and this is their verdict.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course they ought to know who their founder is.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman who proposes to erect this monument?

Mr. McCLEARY. The Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Furnish the money, too?

Mr. McCLEARY. They furnish the money. There is no expense to the United States whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the resolution, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

HON. JOHN HAY.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I will send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the thanks of Congress be presented to Hon. John Hay for the appropriate memorial address delivered by him on the life and services of William McKinley, late President of the United States, in the Representatives Hall, before both Houses of Congress and their invited guests, on the 27th day of February, 1902, and that he be requested to furnish a copy for publication.

*Resolved,* That the chairman of the joint committee appointed to make the necessary arrangements to carry into effect the resolution of this Congress in relation to the memorial exercises in honor of William McKinley be requested to communicate to Mr. Hay the foregoing resolution, receive his answer thereto, and present the same to both Houses of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I could not understand what the Clerk read, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if this resolution has been considered by any committee of the House?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It has not. I would state that it is a copy of the resolution adopted by the House and Senate, both on the occasion of the address by Mr. Bancroft on the death of President Lincoln, and on the occasion of the address of Mr. Blaine on the death of President Garfield. It is simply a formal bringing to the notice of the Committee on Publication the action of Congress in that behalf.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The resolution tenders the thanks of Congress, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is in the exact form of the former resolutions that I have referred to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think it ought to be considered by a committee, and I shall ask that it be referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

#### RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California.

Mr. THAYER. Will the gentleman from California yield a moment? Two or three minutes are all that I ask.

Mr. LOUD. I would suggest that I be recognized. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. What is the motion of the gentleman?

Mr. LOUD. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 11728.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts in the chair, and resumed the consideration of House bill 11728.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I have a request to make regarding the consideration of this bill. The bill contains but one section, but contains quite a number of paragraphs, several paragraphs which I believe are unobjectionable to the great majority of this House. I do not know what the Chair might hold regarding the consideration of this bill, as to whether it will be considered as a whole or by paragraphs, and in order to relieve the Chair from determining that—and it is possible that the point might be made—I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered by paragraphs.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that that was the order taken, that it should be considered to-day by paragraphs. That is the order, as a matter of record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will refer to the RECORD. The Chair is informed that the agreement was that the bill should be considered under the five-minute rule, and that it was not stated whether it should be by paragraphs or by sections.

Mr. SWANSON. I should certainly prefer myself that it should be considered by paragraphs. As I understand the request of the gentleman, it is that it shall be considered by paragraphs and not by sections.

Mr. LOUD. I will say that I am perfectly indifferent about the matter.

Mr. SWANSON. I should rather have it considered by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia object?



Mr. SWANSON. No, I do not, if I understand the request of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered by paragraphs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first paragraph.

The Clerk (proceeding with the reading of the bill) read as follows:

Clerks, 4 classes, graded in even hundreds of dollars, at \$900, \$1,000, \$1,100, and not exceeding \$1,200 per annum.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, to come in at the end of the paragraph which has just been read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 2, after line 7, as a new paragraph, the following:

"That rural free-delivery carriers heretofore appointed and now in the service may be continued as carriers at a rate of compensation not exceeding \$600 per annum, until such time as the Postmaster-General shall advertise for proposals and make awards to the several routes on which such carriers are now employed; and that the Postmaster-General shall not advertise for such proposals or make such awards for any route in operation at the date of the passage of this act until July 1, 1906, or until a vacancy shall occur by reason of the death, resignation, or removal of the carrier who may be serving on any such route at the date of the passage of this act."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against that amendment at this place in the bill. I think it is a proper amendment to paragraph 4, which regulates the appointment and disposal of carriers heretofore appointed. The proper place for that amendment is paragraph 4.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Do I understand the gentleman as raising the point of order on the amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. I make the point of order that it is not germane to this paragraph, but that it is pertinent to paragraph 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the point of order is well taken. It seems to me that this amendment comes in as properly at this particular place in the bill as later, as it refers to carriers already in the service and who presumably will continue in the service. Under these circumstances I do not see that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that inasmuch as the bill is now being considered by paragraphs, and inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman is expressly covered by paragraph 4, toward the close of the bill, this amendment is germane to that paragraph and not to the paragraph now under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. This is offered, I will say to the Chairman, as an additional paragraph, and if adopted of course paragraph 4, as it now appears in the bill, would have to be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that the admission which the gentleman has made would indicate quite clearly that this amendment is in order, not to the pending paragraph, but to paragraph 4, because the gentleman says that paragraph would have to be stricken out if this were adopted. The Chair rules that it is not now in order, but that it would be in order when paragraph 4 is reached.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. LOUD. There is a committee amendment which comes first.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, yes. I thought that the committee amendment had been read.

Mr. ADAMSON. I should like to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] is recognized.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] desires to offer an amendment which is material, and mine is only pro forma.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I obtrude any remarks upon this House, and I feel that I can afford to have a little indulgence. I have some remarks which will take somewhere between four and ten minutes to deliver. They relate to the transportation and delivery of the mails, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed until I conclude my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may proceed until he concludes his remarks.

Mr. LOUD. One moment, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman does not want over ten minutes, does he? I think he ought to ask for not exceeding ten minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. It will not exceed ten and one-half or eleven minutes.

Mr. LOUD. I object to unlimited time.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for eleven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks that the gentleman from Georgia may be allowed to proceed for eleven minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the authority to establish post-offices and post-roads, exercised by the Federal Government under the Constitution, is one legitimate function capable of benefiting fairly and justly all the people of the whole country. It was designed as a sort of general-welfare establishment in which the citizens of this Republic have constitutionally agreed that a sufficient amount of the public revenues shall be devoted to supplying the necessities and luxuries of business and social communication.

Discoveries and inventions, the development of our country, the increase of population and commerce, have changed conditions, altered methods, and somewhat confused conceptions of the system, its origin and purposes. No doubt its operation, however rapid in transit or frequent in trips, should properly be limited to conveyance and delivery of written and printed matter. I can not subscribe to the doctrine professed by some honest but misguided people that the system may be properly run by electricity—that we should take over, own, and operate the telegraph and telephone lines of the country.

In like manner, following to its last analysis the insistence of others for parcels post and postal banks, the system would ultimately flounder and perish in the foolish attempt to monopolize the freight, express, and banking business of the country, while deceiving and disappointing the people of the rural districts in the "penny wise and pound foolish" policy of refusing to deliver newspapers and magazines at a cheap rate of postage. More monstrous, if possible, is the fallacy now advocated by "paternalism run mad," that the Government should drive private enterprise from channels already legitimately occupied and misapply public funds to establish a governmental cable monopoly between our own and far distant countries. Government should confine itself to governmental functions prescribed in the Constitution, leaving private enterprise untrammelled to do "its perfect work" and make profits to pay taxes to enable the Post-Office Department to carry the mails to every home in the land.

While the people will not brook extravagant expenditure, they demand the best service which can be obtained, considering local conditions of business and population. It is not feared that the Department will dishonestly or wastefully spend money; but very often it appears necessary to call attention to the fact that the Post-Office Department is not expected to provide revenues to conduct this Government, nor do very many people desire that it should be made even self-sustaining until its benefits have been extended to every region of the Union, as freely, if not as frequently, as to the more advanced communities now enjoying them.

At least until that stage is reached the people are satisfied that the system shall be liberally supported by the public Treasury, and they regard it as unfair to any suffering community to deny it postal facilities on the ground that they would not be self-sustaining. They are prepared to regard with equanimity a deficit in the postal service just as a man with pride and joy applies his income to the promotion and beautifying of his domestic and social relations, and a man would about as sensibly disrupt his family ties on the ground that they were not immediately financially profitable as for Government officials to talk about a deficit in an expanding and largely experimental postal system, designed and agreed upon solely for the convenience, necessity, and luxury of the people in their social, domestic, business, and political relations, upon no other condition than efficient service and honest administration, which imply business acumen enough to require, not that the Government gets back every dollar expended in each venture, nor yet that the people served get exactly the value thereof, but that they receive efficient, agreeable service, suited to their needs, and that the persons rendering the service are paid what their time, service, and talents are worth.

A carrier on a smooth, a short, or a thinly populated route may work less than another on a longer or a rougher or a thickly populated route, yet he must be committed to that work alone to the exclusion of other occupations. He renders all the service required and should have his pay. Population and business fluctuate; many changes occur to vary the conditions of routes. Certain it is that facilities increase business, especially and conspicuously in the postal service. Under the present administration of the prudent and able men in charge of the distribution of the mails no change is needed, except to authorize the expenditure of a greater per cent of our revenues, so as to hasten the glad day when every community within our borders shall enjoy proper mail facilities, through honest and capable service without regard to income from any particular new venture, leaving and reserving to Congress the task of economizing



somewhere else, if necessary, to supply the funds to meet the demands of the service in which the people find the most valuable return for their money.

The rural free delivery has been as well administered as the appropriation therefor would allow. What the superintendent of that division needs is more money to enable him to have all applications acted on, at the same time so liberalizing requirements and conditions as to permit the extension of the system whenever the people desire it. Eventually the Government should and will deliver the mail at the door of every resident on a public road in the United States. The frequency of delivery will properly depend on conditions of population and business. Present regulations insure the appointment of the carrier selected by the patrons if he is competent, which is local self-government. He should not be appointed if he is incompetent, and experience will demonstrate that unfit persons will be rarely recommended.

The charge of partisanship made here is not sustained by my dealing with the division of rural free delivery. If it is true as to the great States whence the charge comes, it is remarkable that Democrats and Republicans from that region do not agree on the subject. Able Democrats demand a change to escape partisanship, while able Republicans demand a like change to escape fair conditions and secure partisanship.

Republicans are usually alert to discern political advantage, and some of them have been called everything else but dull on those subjects. Nor does there appear sufficient reason for the misgivings of some statesmen as to the power and importance of mail carriers as political propagandists. It is not probable that they will in the near future elect a Congress or control one after its election.

At least our friends in the region susceptible to such influence may find comfort in the careful calculation that persons of equal capacity performing identical duties in the same way, whether receiving higher or lower compensation, alike having to be recommended and examined, would not likely have their persuasive powers increased or diminished through the one differentiating feature of submitting competitive bids as to pay. My experience, I confess, may have prejudiced me against the competitive bidding system; but my observation of its operation certainly does not justify me in advocating its extension to other branches of the service.

The present wise, liberal, and honorable Second Assistant Postmaster-General is doing his best to remedy existing evils. I do not want him loaded down with any other contract system until he completes the reformation of that. He recognizes that a faster schedule can be made over a good road than over a bad one, and that good people laboring to develop a new community which is rapidly increasing in wealth and population are entitled to mail facilities to help them in their work. He recognizes that by making schedules as fast as the road will permit and prohibiting speculative, nonresident bidders he can secure direct competent and responsible carriers, who will do the work for what it is worth and secure to the beneficiaries the full service for which the Government pays.

Wherever he makes a new arrangement he improves the service. But many of the old miserable speculative contracts are yet in operation, or rather in existence; they can not operate. I have no word of censure for the original contractors. They did what they were encouraged to do by the Government under a false system. They took contracts at prices inadequate to run the schedules undertaken. If they pay it all to a subcontractor—which they frequently do, or more—they lose. The subcontractor who undertakes the service for a part of the price is utterly unable to do the work.

In the ruin of both original and sub contractor the people are defrauded of any service, the Government is laughed at as the victim of a disgraceful farce, and the people whom the Government pretends to serve are insulted as well as defrauded by the entire combination, unfortunate though it be. Leaving out of consideration the contractors, both original and sub, for whom I have great sympathy, there is an avenue of honorable escape for the Government and a method of relieving the people concerned. Every such contract ought to be immediately revoked and new provision made for prompt and efficient service which will bear such fruit in satisfying the people that stimulated business and social intercourse, always responsive to facilities, will come far nearer repaying the financial outlay than the present abortive pretense of service can ever do.

No system will work exactly alike in all communities. Uniformity is not a prerequisite to well-doing. This is a great country, possessing varied resources, inhabited by a great people of various habits, ideas, characters, and vocations. Exact equality and sameness can not be maintained in all details of administration. But the officials in charge of distributing our mails at present are able, honest, and as nearly exempt from partisanship as is usual with cultivated mortals. If Congress will abstain from any

legislation concerning them, except supplying the necessary money, and allow them to proceed with the development of present plans, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General will certainly improve the mail service by railway and star routes, while the First Assistant Postmaster-General and the superintendent of rural free delivery will afford the world a revelation in the value and convenience of a general system beneficial to all the people.

Certainly the qualities of judgment and fidelity in exercising the functions of a postmaster while riding a rural free-delivery route ought not to be subjected to competitive bidding against the mere physical act of transporting the mail. In dealing with the administration of the Post-Office Department all good Congressmen should consider the ancient and holy philosophy: "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." [Loud applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum: *Provided*, That hereafter all mail service on rural free-delivery mail routes shall be performed by carriers designated pursuant to an advertisement inviting competitive bidding, except as herein otherwise provided.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out lines 8 and 9 down to and including the word "hereafter," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the word "Hereafter."

Mr. SWANSON. The committee has the following amendment pending: "Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum." I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment, and then I shall ask for a vote. I desire to defeat the committee amendment after it is amended with the amendment which I shall offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will submit his amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 8, page 2, the words "including allowance for equipment."

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Now let it be read as it will be after amended.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the House that in the bill as originally introduced it read, "Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum." The committee have stricken that out, and put "Carriers to be appointed in the future under the contract system." This amendment leaves it doubtful as to whether any additional allowance shall be made for horse hire and equipment or not. I desire it to be understood that carriers shall be paid \$600 and that there shall be no addition to the \$600. My amendment is to the committee amendment, which is stricken out. Then after that amendment is adopted I wish to defeat the committee amendment which proposes to strike that out, and leave it so that it will read, "Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum, including allowance for equipment."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Six hundred dollars a year, with all equipments?

Mr. SWANSON. All that he can get is to be \$600. So that there can be no misunderstanding, I want to say that this bill as originally introduced left it in doubt as to whether \$600 simply was to be paid as a salary, and that possibly might leave it discretionary with the Department to make an additional allowance. Of course we want that fixed, and my amendment is to make it clear that the salary shall be \$600, including allowance for equipment. My amendment will make it read, if it carries, "Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum, including allowance for equipment."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a word. I know exactly what the gentleman from Virginia means, but I believe the language is such that it might be construed as giving to the Department power to pay them extra for equipment. I do not think the gentleman has been happy in the selection of the language to express his intention.

Mr. SWANSON. That is all they are to have for compensation and equipment.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Why do you employ the word "allowance?" Why not use the language "\$600, which shall include horse hire and equipment?" In using the word "allowance" it carries with it the idea that the Department can make an allowance.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to make it clear. You can use any language you want to, but I want it understood that the carrier shall only get \$600, including his labor and his equipment.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Make it \$600 and he furnish his equipment.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. The word "allowance" might lead the Department to consider that they have a discretion.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think including horse hire and cart can make it any stronger, but if gentlemen can suggest what would make it stronger I have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I want to make this suggestion,



so that there will be no mistake. Suppose the gentleman adds this clause, "and no allowance shall be made for horse hire and equipment."

Mr. SWANSON. If you can make it any stronger, I have no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Carriers at not to exceed \$600 per annum, including allowance for equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the amendment accomplishes the purpose that the gentleman from Virginia intends it to accomplish. I think that the language of the amendment ought to be changed so as to say, "and no other allowance for service or for hire of teams shall be allowed the carrier."

Mr. KLUTZ. Why not say, "and no other allowance of any kind whatever shall be made?"

Mr. SWANSON. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire whether this amendment proposes to amend the bill or to amend the committee amendment. I understood by the reading of the Clerk that it is to amend the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is to complete the text before the committee amendment is voted upon. No other amendment has been offered yet.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to state to the members of the House that, believing that the compensation of the rural carriers should be put into the appropriation bill for the year 1903 in accordance with the expressed opinion of the House about two or three weeks ago, that the compensation for that year should be \$600, I went to the Department and asked the officers to prepare an amendment which would cover that, and the exact language was given to me that is offered by the gentleman from Virginia, "at a salary not exceeding \$600 per annum, including allowance for equipment." Now, that is the language prepared by the Department for the appropriation bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But that is the very language you do not want to use.

Mr. HILL. Then the Department does not know what it is talking about.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That language would require the Department to pay for salary and also equipment.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; it is included in the \$600.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want a moment to call the attention of this committee to the phraseology of that language prepared in the Department, as stated, and to what it means. It is the first language used in any law or proposed law up to this time authorizing the Department to attempt to segregate the salary from the equipment expenses. Now, this committee can adopt the Department language in that amendment if it wants to, but they shall not do it if I can prevent it, and be under a misapprehension as to what it means. It means that the Department, under that language, has the authority, and will exercise it, to say that of the \$600 \$400 shall be salary and \$200 shall be the equipment allowance. Now, does any genius know how to lay down a better basis for them to come into the next Congress and say, "Four hundred dollars a year is a pitiful salary for these carriers;" and when you say, "No; they get six," they will say, "No; that has been segregated; \$200 is for equipment allowance and the salary is \$400?" Now, it is a fact this amendment was prepared outside of this Chamber, and it has its purpose, and it is well understood that it will accomplish it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. There is no danger of its being adopted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, so there can be no misunderstanding about it. I think the amendment is all right as it was offered, but I want to withdraw it and offer another one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have fixed it so that there will be no misunderstanding about it. It want to state distinctly that that is all I want the carriers to be paid. Now, I offer to amend so that it will read—

Carriers at a salary not exceeding \$600 per annum, and no other or further allowance shall be made to said carriers.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman? If the gentleman will put in there the words "at a salary not to exceed \$600, no further allowance shall be made," etc.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope this will satisfy the House. My amendment is to make it so that it will read "at a salary not ex-

ceeding \$600 per annum. No further allowance shall be made to said carriers."

Mr. WARNOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman if that amendment would not have the effect of depriving the letter carriers from all commissions for issuing money orders and for selling stamps?

Mr. LOUD. They do not get any commission.

Mr. WARNOCK. Do not they get some allowance?

Mr. SWANSON. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment, so that it will read: "Carriers at a salary not exceeding \$600 per annum, and no other or further allowance for salaries shall be made to said carriers."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment, and if the language is not better than the one proposed by the gentleman from Virginia I will not present it. I will take his judgment. I move to amend by adding, after the words "six hundred dollars," the words "which compensation shall be in full for all services rendered and equipment furnished."

The CHAIRMAN. Is this offered as an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, I offer it if the gentleman from Virginia thinks the language is better than his. It is to insert after the words "six hundred dollars" these words: "which compensation shall be in full for all services rendered and equipments furnished."

Mr. SWANSON. I think that language might include something else—repairs or something of that kind. I do not think the language of my amendment can be made any stronger than it is.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will submit my amendment for a vote of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Which compensation shall be in full for all services rendered and equipments furnished.

Mr. SWANSON. I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is not strictly an amendment to the committee amendment, but is a preferential amendment to perfect the text, to which one other amendment may be offered.

Mr. LOUD. If this amendment should be received, would there not ultimately be three amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the committee amendment and two preferential amendments to perfect the text, which are always in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman from California, who knows the object to be accomplished, will say that he regards the other language as stronger or better to accomplish the purpose, I will withdraw my proposition.

Mr. LOUD. I do not care anything about the amendment. I am only concerned as to where it is leading.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do care something about the matter; and I wanted the gentleman's opinion as to whether my amendment would accomplish the purpose we both have in view.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a suggestion regarding this amendment. The gentleman from Virginia has come here this morning with an amendment fresh from the Department. Now, if there is any design in it, I do not think there is a member on the floor of the House who knows what the design is. The gentleman from Virginia tells you what he wants. He says, "I want this, and when you have done this, I want that;" and he says he is satisfied that the Department does not intend to make any additional allowance.

I would like to know what his authority is for that statement. The gentleman from whom he gets his information has said in unequivocal language that he never meant to recommend, and never would recommend, an increase of salary for carriers above \$400, yet he now recommends \$600. What faith can be placed in the word of a gentleman who has testified on at least two separate occasions, as is shown in the record of the report of his hearing before the committee? The language of the bill, if you want to pay these carriers properly, is sufficiently explicit. If you go beyond the language that is used there, you at least mystify the matter.

This is simply a bill providing legislation, and the appropriation bill when it comes before you, if the Post-Office Committee can have its way, will be so safely guarded in reference to the appropriations made that he who runs may read and interpret correctly the meaning.

Now, there are three or four or five different propositions presented here; and I have no doubt that if this question were



discussed fifteen or twenty minutes longer, there would be some more. The gentleman from Virginia has twice receded from his position on an amendment offered here, thereby admitting that he did not know the effect of the amendment he had offered. I say again, the language of the bill fixing the salary at \$600 is as explicit as this bill should be.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say in reply to what the gentleman from California may say in reference to somebody at the Department. I do not know to whom he is alluding as a man who has twice broken his word. When the deficiency bill was up the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] stated that he wanted to limit these salaries to \$600; and he went to the Department and asked that an amendment be drawn there which they would construe as fixing that limitation. I did not do it.

Mr. LOUD. I should like to ask the gentleman in all sincerity whether the gentleman to whom he refers is afraid that this legislation may get away with him and wants Congress to tie him up so that he can not go beyond the law?

Mr. SWANSON. The gentleman asks me to say something "in all sincerity." I wish to say there is no time when I do not speak "in all sincerity." I am not one who sometimes speaks "in all sincerity" and sometimes does not. I do not know whether the gentleman was making any allusion to myself.

Mr. LOUD. I was referring to the other gentleman.

Mr. SWANSON. I say, "in all sincerity" (for at all times I speak "in all sincerity"), that if any man can show me how the language can be made stronger so as to fix this salary at \$600, which some of us think the language introduced by the gentleman from California who introduced this bill does not do, I should like to hear it. Who introduced this bill? The gentleman from California. The bill provided that the salary of the carrier should not exceed \$600. It was thought that that language might allow something to be added as payment for horse hire, etc.; so we wanted it understood that when \$600 is paid it is to be in full for all allowances, for everything.

The Department thought the word "including" would do that, and they said they would so construe it. They have to construe the language of the bill, and I was satisfied when Mr. HILL told me that the Department did so construe it as including allowance for everything; but there are some members who think it not strong enough, so I was willing to use the strongest language that could be drawn, to fix it so that \$600 would include equipment, would include horse hire, would include repairs and horse feed and everything; and I would like to see anybody get anything that is any stronger.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman read his amendment right there?

Mr. SWANSON. I will read my amendment, and I want every man to listen to it and see if this does not fix it conclusively and definitely, so that there can not be the remotest doubt about it. First, however, I want to explain to this House a parliamentary consideration, so that they can understand it. The bill originally introduced by the gentleman from California had this included in it:

Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum.

The committee decided not to put carriers to be appointed in the future on a salary, so they struck that provision out of the bill as reported from the committee. The proposition before the House now is the committee amendment striking out "Carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum."

It was thought that that language was so ambiguous that the carriers might put in a claim for equipment—for horse hire, for repairs—so the Department wanted it distinctly understood that that \$600 included everything. Now, I propose that that provision shall read as follows, if my amendment prevails:

Carriers at a salary not exceeding \$600 per annum, and no other or further allowance or salary shall be made to such carrier.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That fixes it at a salary alone of \$600. It does not say anything about equipment, does it?

Mr. SWANSON. "No other or further allowance or salary shall be made to such carrier."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I did not hear that.

Mr. SWANSON. There shall be no further allowance for equipment or for repairs.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman if the object of his amendment is to make a uniform salary or a graded salary?

Mr. SWANSON. It is to make a salary not exceeding \$600, and where they do not work but three or four hours they can pay them \$300. This fixes the limit to which you can go. If the carrier works simply one hour he can get \$100.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Who is to determine that?

Mr. SWANSON. The Department, according to the length of time he takes on the route.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think this language will accomplish his purpose more specifically than that he has written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed additional time so that he may answer the question.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. "No other sum shall be allowed or paid to said carrier for service, hire, or expenses."

Mr. SWANSON. The word "allowance" is a broader term than any other term you can get, and I shall insist on this amendment. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I was not in the committee when the gentleman from Virginia offered his amendment. I understand, however, from his speech, that it proposes to fix the salary of rural carriers at \$600, which shall cover the equipment and all expenses and allowances of every kind.

Mr. SWANSON. That is right—not exceeding that.

Mr. CANNON. Not exceeding \$600 a year.

Mr. SWANSON. And on short routes they can pay less.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given but little attention to this bill, but I want to express the belief for myself that \$600 salary to the carrier, when on the average he furnishes his wagon and the two horses that will be necessary and all the equipment, including repairs and maintenance, and covers his 25 miles a day, unless there is a further compensation somewhere or in some way, is not sufficient for an efficient service. [Applause.] I do not believe that an efficient service, on the average, can be given for less than \$1,000 compensation, if it covers the wagon and the two horses and the man every week day in the year. Now, this proposes to limit it to \$600. Where is the other \$400 to come from? If by apt provision you can allow the carrier to be protected in doing an express business or a package business by which he can make the other \$400, then he can afford to perform the service. But unless you do by apt provision and administration allow him to do this you but commit a fraud upon ourselves and upon the carriers and the whole people when you fix the total compensation at \$600. I should be glad to know from the gentleman whether he believes that this will settle the compensation.

Mr. SWANSON. I am satisfied that \$600 will be satisfactory to the carriers. I have heard of no complaints. They are now getting \$500. This is an increase of \$100, and I have found that most of the gentlemen who want to put the service under the contract system say there will be a very great saving, and say they can get it for less than \$600. Those gentlemen have insisted that they can get good service for less than that amount.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe it. I do not believe this Government can or ought to get this service for less than \$1,000 a year, and that \$1,000 a year must come either entirely from the Treasury or a portion of it from the Treasury and a portion of it from the package and express business that the carrier can work up for himself. Now, I think any scheme that we enter upon ought to keep that aggregate compensation in view.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I should like to ask the gentleman if he is not getting satisfactory service on something like a hundred routes in his district now for \$600?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know how many routes there are. I do know that I have had frequent applications favoring an increase of salary; and, further, when you pay \$1,000 a year in the metropolis for a letter carrier and \$850 a year in the smallest city for a letter carrier who works eight hours, and who has no horse nor wagon to keep, I know the man who claims that he can get this service for \$600, with all that it means, is either very short-sighted or is not sincere, in my judgment.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the gentleman favor the contract system or the salary system?

Mr. CANNON. I favor the best system, and earnestly and honestly I am a seeker to find the best system.

Mr. SWANSON. The proposition before the House is to let this on the contract system or to fix a salary.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend contemplate, in addition to the \$600, that the carrier on an average will make at least \$400 from the public?

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say to the gentleman that this amendment simply limits what the Government shall pay. There is nothing in this bill which prohibits him from being an express agent. The Department recently issued a rule—

Mr. CANNON. What does it provide?

Mr. SWANSON. Which prohibits him from acting as an express agent and getting additional compensation, but there is nothing in this bill which prohibits it.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I wish the gentleman could be recognized just a moment further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS], a member of the committee.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois to conclude, if he has not concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. I only want to say this, and I do not want to take much time. I think this House and its membership is friendly to the rural delivery service. I think there is no question about that. I think, further, that we want to do the best we can for this service possible. I think, further, that we want to fix this salary at a sufficient amount to make compensation, and I am trying to find out whether \$600 will do it. Now, the gentleman says the carriers are prohibited from doing express business.

Mr. SWANSON. By the rules of the Department; not by anything in this amendment of mine.

Mr. CANNON. Well, let us change the rule, if it ought to be changed. In other words, if we fix it at \$600 it is idle and foolishness, unless somewhere, by act or proper regulation, the carrier is to get the other \$400.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman offer an amendment making it \$1,000?

Mr. CANNON. I do not want to offer that amendment unless I knew how to express it. In other words, I want to say that I am for \$1,000 compensation, and I am trying to ascertain by gentlemen on the committee and members of this committee, can such an amendment be offered that will give the carriers \$1,000, in part from the public and in part from the Government?

Mr. SWANSON. The gentleman can offer that amendment, if he so desires to do, as the bill is before the committee. I want to ask the gentleman as to what he thinks there ought to be paid in salaries by the Government?

Mr. CANNON. To the carrier?

Mr. SWANSON. To the carrier.

Mr. CANNON. A thousand dollars a year, unless we provide so that he can make the other \$400 from the public he serves, and there will never be a good and efficient service for any less money.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the gentleman get good service in his district?

Mr. CANNON. It has just started.

Mr. SWANSON. How long?

Mr. CANNON. Only a year, to any considerable extent.

Mr. SWANSON. Has it not been a year or two, and the service satisfactory?

Mr. CANNON. It has just started; a good service. When we brought Mr. Machen before the Committee on Appropriations two years ago, I think it was, he said that it would be \$300 a year, and he could get any number of carriers at that. The salary has now been increased to \$600. That service is here, and it is here to stay, and to stay at not less than \$1,000 a year. And I am for it and say so, although you are for it and not willing to admit it.

Mr. SWANSON. No. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that I can not get him to say whether he is for the contract system or the salary system.

Mr. CANNON. I am for the contract system if it will bring better results. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SWANSON. Why do you think it will bring the best results?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, gentlemen, laugh. After all I had hope, not being upon this committee, without any information, that they might make a proper provision for this service. I have no pride of opinion about it. If I had power to make it the contract system or the salary system, under proper safeguards, I do not know which I would do without further information.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the gentleman think the contract system would cost more than it does now to supply the service?

Mr. CANNON. The contract system to the carrier?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; \$1,000.

Mr. SWANSON. You think he would get \$1,000 under a contract?

Mr. CANNON. If it is worth that, he will get it.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope you will plead with the gentleman from California and other gentlemen, who state that it would save money to put it under the contract system.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, if the contract system allows the agent to do a package business, he gets some compensation for that. How much, I do not know. If this system allows the agent to do a package business, he will get some compensation, how much, I

do not know; but I will enter into the domain of prophecy now and say if you fix it at \$600, you will be compelled to increase it to \$1,000, unless the Post-Office Department makes regulations which will allow him to gather up the \$400.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I happen to belong to that unfortunate—if I may use the term—majority of this committee which has proposed to this House the contract system so far as the payment of the rural carriers is concerned. We have been denounced by gentlemen who are opposed to that system as desiring to impose upon the farmer a cheap service in contrast with an expensive service in the cities throughout the country. We have been denounced as being in favor of making hard contracts against the farmer boys and in favor of the city carrier.

Yet the gentleman from Virginia, in proposing his amendment this morning, fixes the salary, in the event that the contract system is not adopted, so that the salary of the rural carrier shall not be increased by allowance or otherwise above \$600. I do not go as far as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] on this matter. I believe that an allowance ought to be made, however, for horse hire and for maintenance and equipment. Gentlemen say we are discriminating against people in the country in favor of the people in the city. And yet these very gentlemen insist that under their system proposed by them the law must unequivocally say that there must be no increase over \$600 for the rural carrier.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Does the gentleman want to offer an amendment to make it a thousand dollars?

Mr. GRIGGS. No, sir.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Did not the gentleman contend that it was more expensive under a salary than it would be under a contract system?

Mr. GRIGGS. I did.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Then why does the gentleman argue that \$600 is too small a salary?

Mr. GRIGGS. It shows the inconsistency of the gentlemen who oppose the contract system.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I think the gentleman is showing his inconsistency and the inconsistency of the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. GRIGGS. I am glad that the inconsistency of gentlemen is not always dependent upon the opinion of my friend from North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I was going on to say that in either event the fixing of the salary for carriers shows what the Post-Office Committee of the House has insisted upon all the time, that the diversity in districts in different parts of the country will demand different salaries. One route can be carried for one sum and another for another, and yet it would be impossible for the Post-Office Department to agree upon any regulation that would fix different salaries in different sections.

In a country without hills, in a level country, a route might be carried for less than \$600. In a hilly country, with rough roads, it might cost more than \$600. The position of the opponents of the contract system here this morning but clinches the position of the Post-Office Committee on that question. We assert that under the contract system the service and pay for it could be regulated to fit the different districts and different sections and different routes throughout the United States without any discrimination.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Could not you do it under the law as it is now?

Mr. GRIGGS. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. In a hilly country they could shorten the route and do it. Down in my country they make it 18 miles if it is a rough, hard road.

Mr. GRIGGS. All I have to say in reply to that is that if the gentlemen who talk about frauds in the star routes will open the door to do this, they will open the door for fraud wider and bigger than any ever was opened to fraud in the United States in the history of our legislation.

Mr. CANDLER. Does the gentleman from Georgia believe that under the contract system you could secure efficient service for less than \$600?

Mr. GRIGGS. I think some routes could be carried for less than \$600.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GRIGGS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRIGGS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of my friend from Mississippi, I say that some routes can be carried for less than \$600 and others may cost more. But my friend



from Mississippi must realize that whenever a maximum salary is fixed by Congress, the Department will pay the maximum salary everywhere in all districts, in all the States, on all of the routes.

Mr. CANDLER. Do they not regulate it now in the Department by making some routes shorter, and paying for a route of 15 miles \$400; a route of 20 miles, \$500, and 25 miles, \$600?

Mr. GRIGGS. I will say that after being six years on the Post-Office Committee, and keeping a close watch on these things, I never heard of a difference of salary in the rural free delivery until this debate came up in the House.

Mr. CANDLER. The Department publishes it in the regulations.

Mr. GRIGGS. In my district there is the same salary for every carrier on every route, and I presume a like condition prevails elsewhere in the United States. They do have what they call half routes, if my friend will permit me. These carriers carry the mail one day, and then the next day they omit it; and then carry it the next day, making an every-other-day service. They have routes like that, but as far as a route of 15 or 10 miles is concerned, I never heard of it until the debate began on this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The rules and regulations in my country do not permit a route for less than 20 miles.

Mr. GRIGGS. Under the rules as submitted to us and as carried out—and I presume in every other district it is the same, as my friend from Georgia says—no route can be established unless it comes up to the rules and regulations which say there must be 100 families and the route must be at least 20 miles long.

Mr. OTEY. Does not the Post-Office Department say in its regulations that upon a route of 15 miles long \$400 shall be paid?

Mr. GRIGGS. I have never seen such a regulation.

Mr. CANDLER. I have read it in the regulations.

Mr. GRIGGS. It must be a new regulation.

Mr. CANDLER. No, I read it a year ago—last summer. It is provided that for 15 miles the pay shall be \$300; for 20 miles, \$400; for 25 miles, \$500, and since then the new regulation allowing \$600 has been made. There has been an increase allowed of \$100 for each 5 miles of travel. That is the regulation of the Department.

Mr. GRIGGS. Then it has never been put into effect in the Second district of Georgia.

Mr. CANDLER. In your district have you had any difficulty in getting carriers at the present salary, \$500, and do you believe there will be any difficulty of that kind in the future?

Mr. GRIGGS. We have been able to get them all along.

Mr. CANDLER. And I presume there have been more applications than you could satisfy.

Mr. GRIGGS. All I am trying to show is that the Post-Office Committee are not the only people in the United States who favor a cheap service.

Mr. LATIMER. Will the gentleman allow me a word? If we are trying to arrive at the most equitable method of payment possible for these carriers, why should we not put the compensation on the basis of \$25 a mile? Then for 32 miles the pay would be \$800; for 24 miles, \$600. This would provide for short routes now in existence. In my district there are a great many routes of 19, 20, 21, 28, or 31 miles. If we fix the pay at \$600, the carrier who travels 31 miles gets only \$600, and the carrier traveling only 19 miles gets just as much. I think, therefore, that the most equitable proposition that can be made is to fix this pay upon the basis of \$25 a mile. In that way the rate of pay can apply equitably to short routes and long routes, to routes in mountainous or in level parts of the country, to routes where the roads are bad or routes where they are good.

Mr. GRIGGS. The gentleman must remember I have only one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Half a minute.

Mr. GRIGGS. There are various methods of computing the service of the carriers on these different routes. The mileage basis, I admit, seems to be an equitable one. But if you are to adopt a rule exactly equitable, the compensation ought to be based upon the number of hours required to go over the route, because—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIGGS. I ask unanimous consent to finish my sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. I will not object if we can take a vote when the gentleman has concluded his remarks. I make the point of order that the debate on this amendment has been exhausted long, long ago.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that the request of my colleague [Mr. GRIGGS] be put.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] desires one minute more.

Mr. HILL. I will withdraw my point of order to allow the gentleman to finish his sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GRIGGS. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. For one minute.

Mr. GRIGGS. The mileage basis of pay would be very equitable provided all the routes throughout the country were exactly similar; but some routes are hilly, some level, some rough, some smooth; some have macadamized roads, some have mud roads. Therefore I do not think the mileage basis, if applied throughout the country, would be equitable. Compensation based upon the time required to go over the route would be the only equitable system, and if some gentleman would offer an amendment like that he would probably find some of us who are against the salary system supporting his amendment.

A MEMBER. And even that system would not be absolutely equitable.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee addressed the Chair.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I make the point of order that debate is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reply to some of the questions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] propounded to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] on the question of salary and an efficiency of the service under the rural service at \$600 per annum.

Mr. Chairman, even at \$500 the Department has had numerous petitions from persons who wanted to be employed as carriers on rural routes already established or about to be established in my Congressional district. I have had, and the Department has had, no trouble in getting intelligent, capable, honest farmers, or country boys to carry the mail under the rural system over the hills, across the mountains, across the Cumberland River, indeed, throughout my great and historic district, at \$500, or at the salaries that have heretofore existed.

I have received no complaint from them of the salaries they have been receiving. The service has been entirely satisfactory in this respect, and I have heard of no other kind of complaints that have not been easily remedied since June, 1900, when the system was begun in my district. Let us compare now the rates received under the old star-route contract system that are still in existence and the new star-route contract system that began about a year ago, which requires the carrier to live on the route he carries, and the rates or salaries paid to the rural carriers. Here are the official figures, and no one denies that the old and the new star route have been and are still clamored for as business or paying investments. What do the official figures show we are paying under the three systems?

We pay under the "old star route 3.83 cents per mile traveled;" under the "new star-route contract we pay 5.72 cents per mile traveled," an increase of "0.68 cent, or 13 per cent," while we pay the rural carrier per mile per year, or 313 working days, traveling 25 miles a day, or 7,825 miles annually, the sum of 0.0767 cent, making a difference of less than 2 cents more for the rural service than for the new-contract star-route service.

Mr. LOUD. I will state, for the information of the gentleman, that the average is less than 22.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am taking the average as 25 miles, the usual number of miles to each rural route. The routes are laid off as near as can be to 25 miles in length, the aim being to get 125 people on each route. The figures which I have used are official. You can find the amounts paid for the star-route service which I have stated at page 209 of the Postmaster-General's report for 1900, while the calculation as to the rural route anyone can make, which shows that we pay 1.95 more per mile for the rural service than we do for the new contract service which shall hereafter obtain in the star-route service.

So there must be something more meritorious in the rural system than in the new star-route contract system, because there is very little difference between the salaries paid in the two services. We find no fault of the rural service, and we do of the contract service. As I stated here a few days ago, there were 2,600 defalcations in the contract system, about 700 in one month, in 1900 and 2,900 last year. In addition to this direct monetary loss—because the bonds sued on in these defalcations proved to be practically worthless—we have under the contract system a bad service, at least an inadequate service, that is unsatisfactory, while the rural service meets the demands of the farmer.

There seems to be no trouble to get contractors under the contract system at about 5½ cents per mile, but we do get an unsatisfactory service, and we have had, and I can not see that we will have any trouble to get carriers under the rural service at about 7 cents per mile, but we do get a satisfactory service.

Let us see how many rural carriers we have. On the 15th of



February we had 7,155; on March 15 we will have 545 more; on April 1, 326 more; on April 15 we will have 16 more. These figures are official. I procured them yesterday. This does not look like we can not get rural carriers at \$600, does it? In addition to this, there are now pending 7,413 petitions for the rural service, while 1,010 cases have been refused. There have been over 16,000 applications for this service.

So it would seem ridiculous to state that we can not get in the future a splendid rural service all over this country at the rate of \$600 a year.

I do not object, in fact, I favor letting the carriers take bundles, etc., and receive compensation just as any other carrier under such regulations as the Department or as Congress may make. The carrier can make an extra honest penny this way without, I think, interfering with his official duties. He is deprived now of this privilege, I am told, by some departmental rule. But Congress can override this rule and give the carrier this right. I shall favor such an amendment to this bill. The Postmaster-General gives the star-route carrier the right to carry freight, and I see no reason why the rural carrier should be denied the privilege.

Under the present system the Postmaster-General has varied the salaries paid according to the services rendered. In a short route he has paid a small salary, commensurate, it seems, with the service rendered. He has increased it where the travel is hard, over mountains, or in river countries. The service, or rather the salary, has been based upon, it seems, the kind and amount of service and not so much upon the miles traveled. Both, however, can be and should be considered in adjusting the question of salaries.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SIMS. This is a practical question. I am not seeking to involve my friend in anything. Suppose the carriers in the country parts of your district request an increase of salary equal to the city carriers, would you not vote for it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. With the present lights before me, I believe they will be satisfied and will make money at the rate of \$600 a year, and will give us a splendid service. Otherwise they would not accept or remain in the service. I have had no complaints at a \$600 salary. The service may be worth more and when it proves to be and the matter is shown to me by petition or evidence, why then it will be time enough for me to decide as to whether or not I would vote to increase it. I have implicit faith in the honesty, the patriotism, and the good citizenship of the country people, and I do not believe that they would insist as a body upon unnecessary salaries or anything else unnecessary for their welfare.

I am the farmer's friend; I have stood by him and aided him in his just and legitimate demands, and I shall continue to do so, and I shall continue to support all measures that tend to alleviate the adverse condition that naturally surrounds him; and I want to say here that I utterly repudiate the accusation that the farmers or rural carriers will resolve themselves into an "army" and march here, or inveigh against Congress by petition or letter or otherwise, and make unrighteous, unjust, or unnecessary demands upon Congress in reference to this rural service.

They have made demands on Congress, and they did it by petition, as they had the right to do. And some of their demands have been granted. But the relief came as the petitions did—legitimately, in decency and order. No one was hurt. Congress was not terrorized. Why, then, with such a record as this, knowing the farmers as we do, should we fear them? Why should we not trust them? Why discredit their good citizenship, their good morals, their high and patriotic purposes? For one I do not and I shall not.

But suppose they do petition Congress. Suppose everyone that we shall appoint or that is appointed will do so, the outside estimate of the total number of carriers that will take the place of each and every one of our star-route contracts will be from forty-five to fifty thousand. Will they demand a higher salary than the star-route contractors? They are already receiving nearly 2 cents more per mile than the contractors, and we see that there are thousands who are glad to get the job, and many of them have served for over two years—some since 1896—and they have not resigned, and but few die.

Again, the rural service is reaching out to supply a daily mail service to 21,000,000 farmers or country people. The Department informed me—that is, Mr. Machen—yesterday that they had figured the cost to serve each one of this 21,000,000 with a daily mail under the rural system at a gross cost of 75 cents per capita; that is, we would pay to serve these 21,000,000 \$15,750,000. This sum, he further stated, was to be credited with the "savings" from the discontinuance of star-route contracts and post-offices and increased revenues from the rural system.

The increase from the rural system last year was 11 per cent,

while there has been an annual gain under this system of from 8 to 10 per cent. Under the nondelivery Presidential offices the gain has been 3½ per cent and in the strictly rural systems 2½ per cent. The Postmaster-General states that last year there was a saving of \$173,404.41 from discontinued star-route contracts and \$120,221.43 from post-offices discontinued, making a "saving," as he said, of \$293,625.84.

Last year, then, we had to credit the output for the rural service \$293,625.84, an increased revenue to the amount of 11 per cent and a splendid and satisfactory service to the farmer. The Postmaster-General says in his last report that under the free-delivery system in cities we are serving 32,000,000 people at a cost of 50 cents each per annum; that on July 1 last we had 866 cities thus served with two mails per day collected by 16,389 carriers, and we paid about \$15,000,000 for the service, or perhaps a little more, while our rural output for our postal service was nearly \$119,000,000—the revenues nearly \$112,000,000.

So to serve 32,000,000 of our people we paid this amount—\$15,000,000—while to serve the country people, numbering 21,000,000, we will pay about the same amount, to wit, \$15,750,000, less the increased revenue and the saving from star routes and post-offices discontinued. Is it but just and fair, if we can do this for the country people, that we should do so? We are serving now in the country about 3,500,000 people with about 7,700 rural carriers, and no member of this House opposes this country service.

Some fear it will cost too much. The official figures which I have shown do not support this contention. And even if it did, we should not despoil the system by placing it under the star-route service that is so objectionable and unsatisfactory. Then, why discriminate against the country people, who support the cities which have free delivery, or the towns which have a convenient service, though not free? Can the cities do without the support of the country? No; they never will. The interests of the two peoples are mutual. The success of one is felt by both; so are the reverses.

Last year the star-route service cost \$5,204,416.86, and still the farmers were dissatisfied, and naturally so, because the service was uncertain—unsatisfactory—and a great body of the farmers were not reached daily. Last year we had 22,797 star routes, with a total length of 267,357 miles. The annual travel necessary to perform service over these routes amounted to 134,404,541 miles. Multiply this number by 7 cents, the rate per mile to the rural carriers, and we get what the cost to the Government would be gross when the star-route service is entirely succeeded by the rural service, the amount being \$9,408,317.87.

I take it for granted that the departmental or clerk hire and incidental expense will be about the same under the contract service turned into a rural service as under the rural service as it now exists. So this expense is a stand-off, we can say.

We then see that by paying 75 cents gross per capita to serve 21,000,000 people (that are now in part served or insufficiently served, certainly unsatisfactorily served, under the star-route service) they would be satisfactorily served by the rural service at a gross cost of \$15,000,000. This sum is to be credited as is shown by the increased revenues of the rural service and the saving from the star-route service, which we see costs over \$5,000,000 annually, and certainly this sum is to be credited by the output saved by the discontinued star-route services and post-offices succeeded by the rural service.

So, assuming that these figures are correct—and my calculations each are based upon official figures—the expense of the rural system, when it partially succeeds the star-route service, or when it entirely succeeds the star-route service, need not scare us from undertaking to perpetuate the rural system in a safe and satisfactory manner, which seems to be the case as it is now.

It can be changed and improved from time to time, and doubtless will be done. It is a new system with us. It is in its infancy. It will doubtless be perfected from time to time, but with the evidence before me, I can not see now my way clear to abandon a service so satisfactory and beneficial to the farmer by substituting the contract system, that has heretofore proven so unsatisfactory both to the Government and to the patrons of the same. It has doubtless been used for political purposes, which is wrong, but should we destroy this system, deny the farmer, for that reason? No. But we should legislate against such abuses and restrain and restrict such abuses as far as possible, which I hope will in the future be done. Now that it is placed under the civil-service laws, we have it placed on the statute books.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I make the point of order that the debate on this amendment is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a pro forma amendment.



Mr. LIVINGSTON. That amendment has been withdrawn by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROMWELL. No; it has not, and it is not going to be until I get through. I am speaking to his amendment. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House—because I do not believe one member out of fifty in this House has read the hearings before the Post-Office Committee, in which Mr. Machen testified—I want to read a portion of what occurred in those hearings.

I want to read a portion of these hearings for your benefit. The question was asked by the chairman of the Post-Office Committee of Mr. Johnson, the First Assistant Postmaster-General:

You have gone from \$300 to \$400, and now from \$500 to \$600, in three years. What evidence have you now that \$600 is adequate?

Mr. Johnson replied:

Because we have gotten along reasonably well with \$500.

The CHAIRMAN. You tell me that they are resigning at the rate of 8 a day, or 2,500 a year. Do you think \$100 additional would be so much more that it would keep them in the service?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think so. That seems to be about the estimate we have from all sources.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom do you get your estimates from?

Mr. Machen answered:

Last August the Postmaster-General issued an order which practically debarred the rural carriers of any perquisites that they were accustomed to get before that.

The CHAIRMAN. What perquisites—prohibiting them from doing anything else?

Mr. MACHEN. From acting as agents for express companies, and such things.

Now, I want to read the next paragraph particularly, for the purpose of vindicating Mr. LOUD's position in this matter:

The CHAIRMAN. Then let me say to you that \$600 is not an adequate salary and I would not advocate it. If a man shall devote his whole time to the service of the Government, furnishing a horse and cart, which will cost him about \$250, I say \$300 is not enough. I don't believe any Government official, knowing the facts in the case, should come here and urge Congress to enact legislation that will give a man a salary of not more than \$350 a year net for all of his time. I am surprised that you can do that.

The First Assistant Postmaster-General replied:

Throughout many country districts they won't earn any more than that.

And Mr. Machen added:

These same fellows will get \$3, \$4, or \$5 a week in a country store, and work much longer hours.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. LOUD] remarked:

Why, some one told me the other day that we were getting schoolmasters and such high-class men as that to perform this service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Through Tennessee they tell us that a good many schoolmasters are employed as rural carriers, and in the New England States also.

The CHAIRMAN. Congress will not say to all these men: We want you to devote your time exclusively to our service for \$350 a year, net. Such a proposition is not worthy the consideration of men. I am pretty emphatic in that, and I have been regarded as a close figurer on salaries. I am surprised that any Government official should advocate it, \$350 salary for a man to do this work, devoting all of his time.

Mr. MACHEN. In most cases we will get men that own their own farms, that have their own horses, or if they are school-teachers they have their horses, and they can afford to do this work with the equipment that they already have much cheaper than a man who has to go to a livery stable and hire a horse, or buy one and go into the business of running this route.

The CHAIRMAN. You will not deny, Mr. Machen, that, taking the country as a whole, the keeping of sufficient horses to perform this work, and the wagons, and the maintenance of the horses, will average at least \$225 a year?

Mr. MACHEN. Not in the country. I will keep horses in Washington in my stable for \$8 a month for feed.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the horses have to be curried and fed and taken care of, and the wear and tear on the horse, and the interest on the money invested—

Mr. Machen interrupted to say:

They all feed their own horses; they have the feed on the farms.

Mr. SWANSON. The school-teacher, on the average, gets about \$35 a month in my State.

Mr. GRIGGS. What is the average pay of a school-teacher in California, Mr. Loud?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty or sixty dollars a month; not less than fifty for women.

Mr. GRIGGS. I doubt if the average is over \$40 a month for the United States. Now, the horses don't cost over \$60 or \$75 apiece; you can get them in Georgia for that.

Mr. MACHEN. I do not think it costs the carriers in Carroll County who own their horses \$150 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the sworn statement of Mr. Hill that the care of a horse costs \$300 a year. All of those items he presented in a sworn statement regarding the conditions in the State of Connecticut. Your salary must be adequate for the maximum man. If a man can work in Georgia for \$200 a year, he must necessarily have \$700 or \$800 in the State of Massachusetts, or in Connecticut or Illinois, or in other higher-priced sections of the country. Will not the man in Georgia demand as much salary as the man in Connecticut?

Mr. MACHEN. That same condition applies to other service. Nobody will contend that it costs as much to live in Toledo, Ohio, as it does in New York, the salary being the same in each case.

The CHAIRMAN. You make a distinction on the size of cities. You can not make any distinction here, because that ought not to cut any figure. You can not say that a man in Connecticut shall get \$900 a year, and that a man in Georgia shall get \$400. You must pay the maximum salary.

Mr. MACHEN. That is right; you must fix one salary for the whole country. Mr. GRIGGS. Twelve and one-half per cent on the cost of horse and wagon would pay for wear and tear.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate on this paragraph be now concluded.

Mr. CANNON. Is that on the gentleman's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. This is on the paragraph and amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask the gentleman not to do that. This is an important question, whether we shall enter into the contract system or shall continue the salary system.

Mr. SWANSON. I make the point of order. I shall insist on closing debate. We have had a week's debate and there has been ample time to discuss it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. We have not been discussing the amendment for a week.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate be closed on the paragraph and amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes, 73; noes, 49.

So debate was closed on the paragraph and amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Is it now in order to move an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, fixing the salary at \$1,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, if the Chair recollects it aright, does not fix the salary at \$900, but simply decides that it shall include allowance, if the Chair is correct. After that amendment is disposed of, it will be in order to move to change the amount.

Mr. CANNON. Then there will be an opportunity hereafter when that amendment can be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be an opportunity after the vote is taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, on the substitute that I presented, if I may have unanimous consent, I desire to make a request concerning it. It is simply a matter of interpretation or the artistic form of the language, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that he may withdraw the substitute which he offered for the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the substitute is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the amendment as it is now be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment as it now is will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 8, insert after the word "at" the word "salary;" also after the words "per annum" in line 8, "and no other or further allowance shall be made to said carrier."

Mr. CANNON. So that the amendment if it is adopted will read as follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read it as if adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Carriers at salaries not exceeding \$600 per annum, and no other or further allowance or salary shall be made to said carriers.

Mr. CANNON. Now, I offer an amendment to the amendment, if it is in order now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "six hundred" and insert "one thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair on first blush is of opinion that it will not be in order now, because the gentleman's amendment leaves the text exactly as it now is in that respect and simply amends it in other respects, and it will not change that phase of the bill. The amendment which the gentleman from Illinois desires would be in order after the one of the gentleman from Virginia has been voted upon. The question is upon the amendment which the Clerk has reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "six hundred," as the text is now left by the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, and insert in line 8 the words "one thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the words "six hundred" and insert the words "one thousand."

Mr. TOMPKINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the amendment. My amendment is to substitute the words "eight hundred" for the words "one thousand;" so that it will read "eight hundred" instead of "one thousand."



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois by inserting "eight hundred" instead of the words "one thousand."

Mr. MAHON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAHON. Is this debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not debatable.

The question was taken on the amendment to the amendment, and it was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, substituting for the words "six hundred" the words "one thousand."

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, yeas 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. A parliamentary inquiry. As I understand the question now, it is this: This amendment on the part of the committee strikes out the whole clause relating to salaries, so that those who want to vote to fix the salary system will vote no on this amendment, and those who want to vote for the contract system will vote aye—

Mr. LOUD. I raise the point of order against gentlemen debating the question.

Mr. HILL. Am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the committee amendment, which is to strike out the words which have already been amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and insert the word "hereafter."

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that section as amended now by the vote taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

But carriers shall not be prohibited from doing an express-package business, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties.

The question was considered, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to move an amendment to the amendment by striking out the words "six hundred dollars" and inserting the words "twenty-five dollars a mile." I want to say to the House—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on this paragraph. The gentleman moves to amend by striking out the words "six hundred dollars" and inserting in place thereof the words "twenty-five dollars a mile."

The amendment was considered, and rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was considered, and rejected.

Mr. LOUD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how that paragraph stands. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOUD. And so no salary is fixed?

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, yes; the salary is \$600, and no further allowance can be made. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The committee moved to strike out of the bill the words "carriers at not exceeding \$600 per annum." Before the motion to strike out was put, I offered a further amendment that no further allowance should be made, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state his understanding of the situation. The bill stands exactly as originally reported by the committee and as printed.

Mr. SWANSON. With the amendment adopted by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to how the bill now stands, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair instruct the Clerk to read the paragraph to the committee as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the paragraph as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Carriers at a salary not exceeding \$600 per annum, and no other or further allowance or salary shall be paid to said carriers, and the carriers shall not be prohibited from doing an express-package business, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties: And provided, That hereafter all mail service on rural free-delivery mail routes shall be performed by carriers designated, etc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso succeeding the amendment, which is contained in lines 9, 10, 11, and 12 on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will either repeat his amendment or submit it in writing.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further I want to submit an amendment at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut has offered an amendment.

Mr. HILL. Would it be proper, Mr. Chairman, to move to strike out the next paragraph on the rest of the page and the top of page 3, or can I only move to strike out the paragraph that has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The only paragraph before the House is the one that has been read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may be allowed to include in his motion all that portion of the bill that refers to the contract service, because that is the proposition before the House, and there is no necessity for taking half a dozen votes upon the same subject.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman can not get unanimous consent to do that. We have plenty of time. The Clerk will read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 9, 10, 11, and 12 on page 2.

Mr. LACEY. Has that paragraph been read, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HILL. It has.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, on page 2.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LOUD. I demand a division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understood, we were considering down to the words "per annum." I have an amendment that I desire to offer to lines 9, 10, 11, and 12.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Iowa has an amendment to those lines, it will be in order before a motion to strike out.

Mr. LACEY. I did not understand that debate had been closed on those lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph extends down to the end of line 12, and debate has been closed on the paragraph.

Mr. LACEY. I do not want to offer my amendment unless I have a chance to say something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California demands a division of the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 97, yeas 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out all the remainder of the bill down to line 19, page 3.

Mr. LACEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph has been struck out.

Mr. PADGETT. But I believe the first clause was left. To that part of the paragraph I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter all honorably discharged ex-Confederate soldiers shall have the same privileges and preferences of employment as rural free-delivery mail carriers as are now, under existing law and regulations of the Post-Office Department, accorded to honorably discharged Union soldiers.

Mr. BROMWELL. I would like to amend that by inserting, after "ex-Confederate soldiers," the words "and colored men."

A MEMBER. They can become carriers under the contract system. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I move to lay both amendments on the table.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order in Committee of the Whole. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. I desire to speak on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted.

The question being taken on Mr. BROMWELL's amendment to the amendment, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 56, yeas 62.

The question being then taken on the amendment of Mr. PADGETT, it was rejected, there being on a division (called for by Mr. PADGETT)—ayes 34, yeas 76.

The Clerk read the next paragraph of the bill, as follows:

First. That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on any mail rural free-delivery route, the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days, in a conspicuous place accessible to the public, in the post-office from which the mail is to be carried, inviting proposals, in such form as he may prescribe, for the service to be performed. The service shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who shall furnish evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster-General that such bidder is a legal and actual resident of the district or territory in which the proposed service is to be performed; that he is a reliable and trustworthy person, of good moral character, able to read and write, and having sufficient intelligence and ability to properly perform the service, and who shall tender sufficient guaranties that he will personally perform acceptable service; but the



Postmaster-General may reject all proposals submitted under any advertisement.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Add at the end of the paragraph the following:

"Provided, That no person shall be awarded a contract for more than one route under this paragraph."

Mr. SWANSON. I move to amend by striking out the paragraph just read.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I wish to offer an amendment which I think takes precedence of the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Before the question is taken on striking out this paragraph, it is in order to offer amendments to perfect it.

Mr. SWANSON. I recognize that amendments must first be voted on before the question is taken on my motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to strike out will be regarded as pending.

Mr. SWANSON. I claim the right to be recognized for five minutes on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. I yield my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the rural-delivery system is yet in its infancy, and I desire to say that no law passed by Congress in many years has been more in the interest of the masses of toilers in the country than this.

It is the best educator for the people in the rural districts that has been attempted by the Government, and I am opposed to beginning thus early to meddle with a system which is doing so much good.

I have only a few routes in my district, yet wherever they are established the effect is soon apparent.

The first route established in the district was from my home town of Gadsden, a little less than two years ago. The carrier, Mr. Sutton, is an intelligent farmer, who is as proud of his route as the engineer becomes of his engine, and has great pride in building it up.

At the anniversary of its establishment he had a little entertainment at his son's house and invited several friends to be present, and I was one of his honored guests. In the meantime I had secured two other routes from the same place, and the carriers were both present at the old gentleman's reception, both of them men of reputation and intelligence. The old man entertained the party by detailing some facts concerning his route.

Among other things he showed that there were daily papers being taken by citizens along the route, into whose homes a daily paper had never regularly gone before. He showed that the circulation of weekly papers had more than doubled along his route within the year. He showed that the correspondence of the people had greatly increased. He showed that he, himself, was encouraging the people along his route to take and read the papers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that had been some underpaid, ignorant carrier, under the contract system, who was carrying this mail at starvation prices, do you suppose he would ever have raised his voice to encourage the people thus to extend and enlarge their facilities for education?

On the contrary, with his poor horse and his rattletrap cart, he would have discouraged them, in order to make his own burden lighter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this work was in part undertaken by our Government for the purpose of aiding in the education of the people. If so, this very purpose will be largely promoted by having well-paid, intelligent carriers, who will take pride in aiding this purpose of a splendid system.

So far as the people are concerned, it is working well under the present arrangement. Then shall we tear it down merely because it is perverted to political ends in some sections?

The great masses of the people are not raising their voices against the partisanship in the appointment of carriers. Then is it right that it shall be torn down and upon its ruins another system of at least doubtful efficiency be built up merely to aid the waning fortunes of some politician?

The partisan discriminations that gentlemen have referred to in this debate are wrong and should not be made. But at last, unless the people for whose benefit the system was established are crying out against such partisanship, are they badly hurt by its existence?

If partisan carriers are impairing the efficiency of their service by any injustice to members of any party, then, Mr. Chairman, that matter, by proper charges, protests, and proofs, can, under this bill, be easily remedied. If they are guilty of pernicious interference in politics, that, too, can be corrected.

But let us not undertake to visit against a wise and wholesome law the infractions of that law.

Is it true that the advocates of this bill see that the people are

becoming informed and will become more and more so, and for that reason desire to destroy the source of this information and wreck this means of that development? I hope not; and yet I believe that the effect of this bill, if passed, will be right along that line.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see my people educated. Without the education of the boys and girls—the young men and maidens of my country—I see before them the dark clouds of adversity and financial trouble rising higher and higher as the years come and go. The time was when the old farmer could get along with the meager requirements of the three-months' school attended between the crop seasons; but in these days, when every article that he buys and every article that he sells is controlled by trusts or by the gambling boards, the only way in which he can enable his son to cope with them is by putting in the head of that son that which the execution in the hands of the sheriff can not take from him.

Let no cog be placed in the wheels of such development. Let a just government that takes a just pride in an intelligent citizenship not lay its heavy hand upon a system which, if fostered, will prove a benefaction to the toiling masses remote from the crowded marts of trade.

Gentlemen cry out that if the present system of paying the carriers is continued it will take an enormous sum to support it. Some tell us that one hundred millions will soon be required to support the system. So far, it has not approached that mark very rapidly. But suppose it does. The money is going to be spent somehow, and should it so arouse the fears of those who keep watch at the Treasury door, because a few paltry dollars of it is beginning to drop into the slender wallet of the farmers of my country? Better spend it that way than to be squandering it by the millions in shooting Christianity into Filipinos who are crying for freedom. Better let it go into the pockets of the farmer boy who rises with the sun and goes whistling to carry the letters to the eager neighbors along his way than to pay it into salaries to the dodos with which to practice polygamy in our distant isles. Better let it go to pay some sun-browned son of toil to deliver sweet love-laden missives to the country lass than to pour it into the coffer of the trusts.

You pay your Philippine governor \$20,000 per year, and yet you complain to pay the struggling carrier the paltry sum of \$600 per year from which to furnish his cart and horse and his own hard toil.

Gentlemen argue that there will be a large deficit in the Post-Office Department; that it will not be self-sustaining. Well, let the deficit come. We have had a deficit every year in that Department since 1860 except one. The burdens of taxation are upon the people anyway, and if it is spent in affording better facilities for education and mental development, in order to prepare them to meet the changed conditions that confront the masses, I say let the appropriation grow and increase until at every cottage doorstep the foot of the mail carrier may be heard every working day in the year.

The Treasurer's report to-day shows an available surplus of more than \$175,000,000. Take off \$70,000,000 by cutting out the war revenue and we still have over \$100,000,000, and that vast sum increasing every year.

The Republican party votes down or smothers every proposition looking to the reduction of the burdens of tariff taxation. In order to promote and encourage trusts, they propose to keep those taxes at the high-water mark. So great has this infamy become that many of the things purchased by our consumers are sold to the English farmer cheaper than to the American, and with unblushing audacity they smile while their victim complains at this injustice, and ridicule his cry for relief.

Gentlemen, we see no relief to come during the present Administration, and if the money must be piled higher and still higher in the coffers of the trusts and in the Treasury of the Government, in the name of common justice I beg you to let some of it flow back to the relief of the people from whom you have extorted it.

I would have favored the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to increase the pay of the carrier to \$1,000 but that I believe it was put on for the purpose of loading down the bill and defeating it.

Again in reply to the threat of a deficit, the Postmaster-General in his report shows that the deficit for 1903 will not be \$3,000,000, which is less than a third of what it was three years ago.

With this little deficit what untold benefits will come to the 6,000,000 of people who each day step to their gates and take their mail from the hands of the carrier as he passes, or from the boxes near by.

The bill seeks to let the routes to the lowest practicable bidder, with certain restrictions. Gentlemen, when you do this you have destroyed the efficiency of our system. Every day the people



in some country neighborhood or another have to suffer from the inefficiency of underpaid carriers, whose cart is breaking down or whose horse is giving out or dying.

But a few days ago I received a letter from one of my constituents asking me to see if the Post-Office Department could not help him to collect his ferriage from a delinquent star-route carrier. The carrier had bid off a double daily route from the railroad to the county seat of one of my counties for about \$138, and had contracted to pay \$150 for his ferriage. He expected to supplement by carrying passengers and freight to and from the railroad, but this would not work, and he soon found himself unable to even pay his ferriage.

This is but one instance among many of a similar character.

In the cities our friends have their mails delivered inside their doors two or three times a day by carriers who receive from \$800 to \$1,000 per year, working eight hours each day.

Should one of these carriers fail for a few days to deliver the mails promptly, what a howl would be raised. Yet the Representative of the city constituency thinks it a matter of no importance if the people in the country and the smaller towns are the victims of the underpaid carrier along their routes.

Gentlemen, if you honestly want to economize, why is it that you always want to begin among the poor and the oppressed? This is no cry of demagoguery, but is the statement of a solemn truth. Whenever it is desired to better the condition of the toiling masses in the country by holding out to them some of the benefactions of a great Government, some man begins to cry out economy, and if there be one who would stand between them and the impending blow, he is taunted with being a demagogue.

This rural delivery, Mr. Chairman, will, if fostered, bring much good to those who are to-day struggling for intelligence and information; and no false cry of economy can deter me from lending it my aid until the voice of the rural carrier is heard upon every roadway in the land.

I want to see it extended until it webs every rural district. I want to see in every cottage the weekly county paper, at least, and in as many as possible the daily paper, so that those who toil can learn to watch the cunning of those who do not.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], with a sort of spirit of humiliation, confesses himself to be the father of the rural-delivery child, but claims that he brought the bairn into the world with the understanding that he would never earn more than \$300 per year. But since the child has begun to grow and wax strong and to merit twice that amount, the unnatural father wants to strangle him in his own home. But, fortunately, this big infant persistently refuses to be strangled, but is just about to overturn the father himself. And he ought to do so. Shame upon any man who would state before the assembled representatives of the American people that because he was told that the farmer could carry the mails over 20 to 25 miles every day, through mud and slush, through rain and snow, furnish his horse and wagon, feed his horse, himself, and his family for \$300 per year, and because the people say he is worth more and demand it for him will now try to wreck and destroy the system! Shame, I say, upon such a man!

But, Mr. Chairman, it will not be done. The representatives of the people are here, and in solid ranks we will meet the assaults of those who would tear down the rural system and strike down the assailant, until not one shall be left to raise his lance against this splendid means of education for those who can not go to the more costly institutions of our land. Let the good work go on!

If a protective-tariff system continues to take the money from the sweat of the toiler and pile it up in the coffers of the Government, let this be one of the arteries through which a small portion may flow back to the people. If it flows into their hearts and their heads, it can do much good, and as education, intelligence, and good morals increase it can no longer be said of us—

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I will ask the Clerk to read, and I ask in this connection unanimous consent that it be considered in connection with the preceding portion of the bill. It is a complete and coherent proposition in itself; but I would like to get it before the committee without confusion so that they may get the sense of it.

Mr. SWANSON. I reserve all points of order on the amendment until I hear what it is.

Mr. LACEY. Very well; let it be read first, and we can agree on the form in which it may be presented to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in lines 4 and 5 of page 3 and insert:

"Provided, That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to test the practicability of performing the rural free-delivery service by contract on such newly established routes as he may select, under the following conditions:

"First. That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on

any mail rural free-delivery route by contract, the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days, in a conspicuous place accessible to the public, in the post-office from which the mail is to be carried, inviting proposals, in such form as he may prescribe, for the service to be performed. The service shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who shall furnish evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster-General that such bidder is a legal and actual resident of the district or territory in which the proposed service is to be performed; that he is a reliable and trustworthy person, of good moral character, able to read and write, and having sufficient intelligence and ability to properly perform the service, and who shall tender sufficient guaranties that he will personally perform acceptable service; but the Postmaster-General may reject all proposals submitted under any advertisement: *Provided*, That no person shall be awarded a contract for more than one route under this paragraph.

"Second. That no additional compensation shall be allowed to a rural free-delivery carrier unless pursuant to an advertisement and award of service as herein provided.

"Third. That under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may prescribe, a substitute carrier may be employed, at the expense of the regular carrier, to temporarily perform the service on any rural free-delivery mail route.

"And shall report to Congress, not later than January 10, 1903, his views regarding the practicability and advisability of performing such service by contract thereafter."

Mr. SWANSON. I make a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. SWANSON. My point of order is that the committee has already voted that this rural-delivery service shall be by carriers and not by contract. This is simply the bill reintroduced by the gentleman from Iowa. This committee has already decided in the amendment just adopted that rural-delivery service shall be by salaried carriers. This is to change that by a contract system, and I say it is contrary to what the committee has already decided. That question has been passed on, and having been passed on it is not in order to bring it up for decision again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that although the committee may have expressed its intentions in the former paragraph as to the general principle, yet that would not be inconsistent with a wish to experimentally try the contract system as is proposed in this amendment. It is not for the Chair to determine that the committee would hold the two inconsistent. That is for the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order. I understood the gentleman from Iowa offered this resolution and asked that it be considered in connection with the amendment which was made a while ago. That has been passed and we are now on another paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Iowa to withdraw whatever proposition he started to make.

Mr. HILL. Do you understand that this amendment is offered as an amendment to the first, second, or third paragraph?

Mr. LACEY. It is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment. I gave notice, however, that further on I will move to strike out the preceding words, because this duplicates the language.

Mr. HILL. There is a motion already pending to strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. SWANSON. As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has well said, I have a motion pending to strike out this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. That is pending.

Mr. SWANSON. That was the first motion submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, this is also a motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. LACEY. A substitute for your motion to strike out and insert.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that it was so stated.

Mr. SWANSON. In what form does this amendment come in?

Mr. LACEY. The heading of the amendment will show.

The CHAIRMAN. It moves to strike out the proviso in lines 4 and 5, page 3, and to insert instead thereof.

Mr. LACEY. This is a substitute for the amendment, which is a motion to strike out, without inserting anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso in lines 4 and 5 is the committee amendment. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the committee amendment which is pending and to substitute instead thereof the amendment which the Clerk reported.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, if this amendment should prevail, it would be an amendment to the first section.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is an amendment to the committee amendment to that section practically.

Mr. SWANSON. To that section. If that is carried and my motion to strike out prevails, then his amendment, including section 2, goes out?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. There is no difficulty about the proposition, Mr. Chairman. I would ask before commencing that I have unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes instead of five.



Mr. HILL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to the gentleman having the five minutes to which he is entitled under the rule.

Mr. LACEY. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is entirely welcome.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition that the gentlemen who favor this bill have announced themselves as entirely favorable to. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] in his remarks the other day told us that he would like to have the experiment tried. Now, I am with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] in his opposition to the attempt to change this system generally to the contract system, and voted with him upon that proposition; but the present proposition is a simple one, authorizing the Postmaster-General to try experimentally a few contract routes. He is establishing routes every day, and this simply authorizes him to try the experiment of letting some of them by contract.

Certainly that is an experiment that ought to be made, and perhaps ought to have been made heretofore; but it has not been made, and therefore it ought to be made now, and by the time Congress takes this matter up again we will have had a fair test of the question as to whether one system is better than the other.

I think my friend from Virginia ought to recognize the fact, if he believes that the salary system is better than the contract system, that a test of a few routes by the contract system would only demonstrate all the more clearly that he was correct in his original proposition. If, on the other hand, it proves satisfactory and is found to be more efficient and cheaper than the present system, it ought to be adopted. In other words, we ought to try both systems instead of adopting a hard and fast rule that will tie the hands of the Postmaster-General and prevent him from investigating any other method than the one proposed in this bill. That is all there is in this proposition. It is a very simple one and a very just one. No difference which view any member of this House may take as to whether we ought to have the contract system or the other system, certainly there is no reason why the contract system is not worthy of a trial, and that is all this amendment proposes, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. TOMPKINS of New York. Does this leave the carriers to be appointed at \$600 a year?

Mr. LACEY. This leaves the carriers to be appointed at \$600 a year, leaves the law just as it is, but authorizes the Postmaster-General to make a few contracts, a sufficient number to investigate the question; contracts for the new routes to be established, a sufficient number of them to test the effects of this service. Now, why should not this be done?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in attempting to discuss this question, I feel very much like the young man who was commissioned to write an essay on "The Snakes in Ireland," and who began his essay by saying, "There are no snakes in Ireland." I am sorry, sir, to acknowledge that in the district I have the honor to represent, which is perhaps one of the most intelligent districts in my State, there are no rural-delivery routes. None have been established. I have earnestly been endeavoring to get routes established in my district since the day I came to Congress, and have requested the Department to send inspectors there, but an inspector has not visited my district. Applications, however, for several routes are now pending.

I do not say this, Mr. Chairman, in justification of the bill now pending before the House, because I am opposed to it. I am opposed to making any change in the experiment the Government is now making of a system which seems to be perfectly satisfactory to the people who are trying it and enjoying its benefits, privileges, and blessings, because I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this system will prove a great blessing to the whole country. I am not in favor of injecting now into this project any scheme that will cripple it or that will in any way destroy its usefulness where it has been established or where it will be established. Now, I am surprised at the proposition presented by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], in asking business men upon the floor of this House to experiment with an experiment. He says that the Postmaster-General should go out and make a few experiments and report back to this House.

Mr. Chairman, that seems to me child's play, for a man with his experience to talk to business men about such a proposition as that. I think that the Representatives upon the floor of this House are practical enough, have had business experience enough, to know that the system which we are now enjoying is conducted on a reasonable basis; that we can not inaugurate any plan under which the Government can get its work done and let the people enjoy this benefit for a less rate of compensation than \$600 per annum.

Mr. LACEY. How does the gentleman know that without try-

ing it? I propose that the Department should try it. This system of carrying free delivery has never been tried.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have seen the abomination, curse, and disgrace of the star-route system in my district, and it has been a menace and shame upon this great Government to have such carriers as are imposed upon our people under this star-route system. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to this Government bartering its offices out in any such way as has been done under the star-route system. Speculators have gotten in charge of this system, and they are imposing upon the people of my State. I have now, Mr. Chairman, letters from four good men who have been induced by undue influence to take contracts on these star routes at such a price as they are unable to carry them for, and they are begging me by petition and letters to see the Post-Office authorities and get their pay increased. Mr. Chairman, we do not want any more systems of this kind imposed upon our people. Six hundred dollars for carrying the mail twelve months in the year and twenty-six days in the month is, in my opinion, a very small compensation for the work; and, besides, the rural carrier has a great deal more responsibility than the ordinary star-route carrier. He has the responsibility of a postmaster; he is carrying a post-office on wheels. [Loud applause.]

The mail carrier is required to travel regularly in all kinds of weather, rain or shine, cold or hot, and take with him a supply of stamps and receive money for money orders, postal notes, etc., and for this responsibility and labor he is entitled to reasonable remuneration, as well as for the use of his horse and wagon which he is required to furnish.

I am as much in favor of retrenchment and reform as any member of this House, but why begin here to use the pruning knife? Let us see. The city carriers are paid from \$900 to \$1,200 per annum, and yet not one word is said by these economical gentlemen about placing them under the contract system, or putting that service up to the lowest bidder.

Mr. Chairman, I can not see how or why the bill is here at all. As a rule, when any such sweeping and important new project or change in existing law is brought before Congress there is a large popular demand behind it, or at least the semblance of such a demand. That is the case with the other large measures now before Congress—Chinese exclusion, the isthmian canal, the Cuban question, the Philippine question, the Pacific cable, ship subsidy, oleomargarine, protection of the President, war-revenue-tax repeal, reclamation of arid lands, Territorial statehood, and so forth. But this bill appears to have no popular backing whatever. There is no excuse or occasion for it at all.

If the advocates of the bill could prove that the contemplated change would be an improvement on the present system that would justify the bill, even if the country had not asked for it. But they have not proved it. They have not made out their case at all. I have listened to all their arguments in vain. They do not carry conviction. There is nothing in them. All that the champions of the bill can say is that they fear the salary system may become too expensive, and that they hope the contract system may prove more economical. Their opinions, Mr. Chairman, are worth no more than the opinions of those who differ with them. In fact, they are not worth as much, because it can be proven that the present system is a great success, and the presumption is always against a change.

As it is conducted now the rural free mail delivery has the respect and the hearty approval of the whole community. The farmers and others living in and near the small villages and sparsely settled towns are delighted with it. It has ushered in a new era in the rural districts, and has relieved them, in a great measure, of their worst disadvantage and drawback—isolation. For ages past and until the advent of this beneficent system the great trouble with the farmers and their families has been that they could not keep up with the times. They absolutely could not spare the time from their work to go every day to the post-office, perhaps 2, 3, 4, or 5 miles distant; and, even if there were time, there would be other obstacles—bad roads, storms, sickness, etc. Herein the city people always have had until now the advantage. No matter how busy they might be, or how sick, or how bad the weather, the city people have had their mail delivered regularly once or twice or oftener every day; and now, thanks to this new rural mail delivery, the farmers at last have begun to get theirs, too, with equal regularity.

The farmers are entitled to just as much consideration and just as good service as those who live in cities. They are the bone and sinew of this country. Put a wall around your cities and shut out the country, and grass will soon grow in the middle of the streets. Tear down your cities, and the country will soon build new ones. The country is the pure fountain that sends forth our best men and women. The men who wield the greatest influence upon this floor are the men who come from the humble country homes. Our great men do not come from the gilded palaces where lives of ease, comfort, and elegance are spent;



nor from the cities where vice, dissipation, and immorality reign supreme; but from the industrious, Christian, country homes that are uncontaminated by evil influences.

Thus, if a preference is to be shown, we owe it to the country and not to the city. The farmers, the honest tillers of the soil, have been overlooked and neglected, and I can not support a measure that will in any way deprive them of the service they are entitled to.

If let alone, this system will grow and the time will soon come when this great, progressive Government will be sending the mail each day to the door of every farmer in the land. I will not be content until the people whom I represent shall enjoy this blessing. The daily rural free-mail delivery not only disseminates knowledge and enlightens the homes of the people, but it also encourages the movement for better public roads. One of the prerequisites for obtaining a general rural delivery is good roads. To establish and build good roads through the agricultural districts of this country will increase the value of our lands and make our farmers more progressive, more contented, and more happy.

We must encourage our people to live on their farms by making farm life more comfortable by placing daily papers in their homes. The newspaper is perhaps the most potent factor in popular education to-day. It molds public sentiment; it inspires higher ideas and nobler purposes, and creates in the breast of the country boy an ambition to move out on broader lines. Send the papers, daily and weekly, to the homes of our people; encourage them to read and to keep in touch with our Government in its progress and you will increase the wealth of the nation. The records show that Congress has dealt out its appropriations with a lavish hand to the great railroad corporations to induce them to carry the mails quickly between the great cities.

The last Congress appropriated \$175,000 to one railroad for carrying the mails a few hours quicker between New York and New Orleans. No thought of economy was suggested by any member here then. But now the people in the country are to have some benefits, and we hear the cry "Economy, economy!" I can not give my support to any measure tending to destroy, impair, or impede this present rural-delivery system. I hope soon to be able to get it established all over my district and to send the mail to the door of every farmer in it each day. Then will the prophetic words be realized:

Lo, the winter is past; the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds has come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.

[Applause.]

The rural carriers have been a part and parcel of the communities they have served, men known personally to all the families along their routes, respected and trusted by them all. They have been appointed in the same way and on the same footing as other employees in the mail service, the same as city carriers and railway mail clerks and post-office clerks. They have been selected on their merits, and have served on their merits. The people whom they serve so well have come to regard them with affection as personal friends. Many instances have been reported where the farmers have voluntarily shown their appreciation by befriending and assisting the carriers in various ways, by giving them coffee and food and feeding their horses, by giving them shelter and warmth in a time of tempest, by breaking the roads ahead of them in snowstorms, etc. Fancy them doing such things for a contractor, especially when that contractor is represented by a stupid hired menial.

Now, without any complaints against these carriers, without any popular wish or demand for a change, without any good reason whatever for it, we are suddenly asked to upset this splendid system which has been so satisfactory and beneficial to our rural communities, and to substitute for it the old, discredited, corrupt star-route contract system, letting out these rural mail routes to the lowest bidder on contract. For heaven's sake, why? Will the contractors do the work any better? They can not possibly do so. They will probably not do it as well. Will they do it any cheaper? No; it can not be done any cheaper, if done well, than it is done now. If there should be now and then bids for contracts much lower than the salaries now paid, that would simply be presumptive evidence that the bid was not in good faith, or that it meant inferior service.

It is true that the bill professes to prevent collusion, straw bids, subletting, and other well-known scandals of the contract system; but the scandals would creep in all the same. They always do. They did in the old star-route times, as we all know. They do to-day. There is any quantity of subletting in star routes to ignorant, illiterate, irresponsible persons in our Southern States right now, and I have no doubt it is the same way up North and out West. The farmers have no love or sympathy for the star-route contract system. They want the present system continued, and it ought to be continued. It is successful, universally liked,

and will soon pay for itself, as the similar system now pays for itself in the cities.

The more this supposed extension of the contract system is contemplated the more repulsive it appears. The records show that it has always been a failure as between the Government and individuals. It has uniformly led to inferior work, popular dissatisfaction, dishonesty, and scandal. The Government has no right—no moral right, at least—to rely on the contract system for executing the public work, except in cases where no other is possible—as, for example, in the carrying of immense quantities of mail for all distances by rail and on sea or in barren sections of the country and wildernesses of vast extent where scarcely anybody resides. If the Government should put the rural delivery under the contract system, why should it not put the postmasters and the post-office clerks and the War Department and the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing under the contract system? Very likely it could find persons willing to bid very low for the privilege of coining the Government's gold and silver and printing its currency.

The whole atmosphere surrounding the contract system is one of duplicity, jealousy, and dishonesty. There is a great tendency in it even to the awarding of contracts as well as in the execution thereof. Bribery and collusion are inseparable from it. Inferior and dishonest work is its natural and inevitable offspring.

On the contrary, the whole tendency of the present system is toward better and better public service and steady progress upward morally and socially and intellectually in the whole community. To upset this system just as it has got well started, and to substitute for it the malodorous contract system, which the farmers distrust and do not want, would be, to put it in the mildest possible term, an inequitable folly.

By all means, defeat this proposition. Let well enough alone. [Applause.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, one of the strongest arguments that was made by the gentlemen who are opposed to the pending bill was that the Post-Office Committee was trying to impose something upon the House that had not been tried, something that was purely experimental, and that might fail. Here comes a proposition, which is presented by the gentleman from Iowa, which gives power to the Postmaster-General to make an experiment to see whether or not under the contract system this rural free delivery can be conducted in a proper manner. It does not supersede the regular carrier nor the regular system. They are not affected.

The other day the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] in his appeal to this House stated that he felt that an experiment should be made, and that they were not opposed to an experiment under the contract system; but now when the question comes whether or not we will make the experiment objection is raised in every way that it can be. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: We are beginning a system which is going to have 50,000 employees. It is a great system. It is one that ought to be conducted on business lines. An experiment should be made to determine whether or not it can be conducted properly and in a business manner upon the contract system.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. Are there not many routes in Colorado that could not be let for \$600, and therefore this would give an opportunity for more expensive routes to be established?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have no doubt of that, and I have no doubt that in many instances routes will be obtained under the contract system which could not be obtained under the other. The routes in some parts of the country, as in Colorado, are very long, because distances between cities and towns are very great. Other routes are over mountains, where the service can not be had for \$600 a year. Should we be denied the benefit of rural free delivery because such a limit has been fixed in the bill? We know there are inequalities in almost all the routes. It has been shown that they vary in length from 16 to 38 miles; some over good and others over muddy roads; some in a hilly and others in a level country; some in densely and others in sparsely settled communities. There are various other inequalities. If the Department could demonstrate to gentlemen of the House that the contract system is better for some parts of the country, why not give it the opportunity to do so? Why should not the lover of the rural free-delivery system be in favor of adopting a provision which will give us ultimately the very best system and permit the Department to ascertain by experiment which is the best?

The system should and is going to cover the entire country. The question whether it can be done at an economical cost to the Government is one that is going to seriously affect various other questions in the Post-Office Department. We are all hoping for a 1-cent letter postage. Everybody desires it, but if an increase



of salary is to occur, such as is indicated by the conservative chairman of the Appropriation Committee or as has been admitted by a number of gentlemen who have spoken here on the floor of the House, you can readily see that it would impair the revenue derived from the Post-Office Department to such an extent that it would be impossible ever to obtain 1-cent letter postage in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for an experimental service only. We have passed the section which requires the employment of post-office employees on a salary. This provision simply says to the Postmaster-General: "You can make the experiment and see how it will work as to the rural free delivery." He can report the result back to this House; he can not adopt it as a general system without your consent; unless the figures which he presents demonstrate that it is a better system or that it would make the service better throughout the United States, you will have the say as to whether or not the result of that experiment shall be made a permanent part of the service of the Department. It will also give relief to such parts of the mountainous States where the routes are too difficult to admit of a \$600 service, and I therefore hope that the amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this House might as well be frank in the discussion of this question. Some of us pretend to be in favor of the contract system and some in favor of the salary system. For one I have listened to the debate, and I am willing to state frankly and fairly that I am in favor of this salary system. We might as well be frank about it. We can not deceive this House nor the country. It is a question whether we should be in favor of paying the rural carriers \$600 a year or whether we shall be in favor of permitting it to be let by contract, some carriers to receive \$200 and some \$1,000 or \$1,200.

Now, gentlemen of the House, who are the men that want to carry this mail? They are our own people; they live in our own country; they pay our taxes; they support the flag and maintain the Government. If we pay to 17,000 carriers in the city in the neighborhood of \$800 or \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year, what reason is there that we can assign to our constituents in the country that they should not be paid \$600 for services rendered? It seems to me that the amount we are asked to pay to these men is not exorbitant; that the amount to be paid is fair and reasonable and just, and for that reason I am in favor of coming out squarely and taking a direct position upon this question and saying that we are in favor of paying a salary to these people.

Some say that this is an experiment. There is not a gentleman in this House but knows that this rural delivery is here to stay. We are constantly being importuned by our people throughout the district to increase the service and to enlarge the system, and if that be true why should we try and dally in one way and another and talk here in favor of taking one position or another? To me it is perfectly plain that the country is in favor of the salary system. I venture to say that there is not a man on the floor of this House who has received a communication from his people to favor, as an experiment, the star-route system in the rural free-delivery service. On the contrary, for days and days I have been receiving communications from my people asking me to favor paying the rural carriers who are bringing the citizens their mail in the country, putting them into communication to-day with the city and with the world that they desire to be put in communication with, and for one I am willing to take my stand and vote in favor of paying these men \$600 a year.

The question about whether it is a large amount or whether we are entering upon a great unknown field is a question that might have been asked when we started to pay the city carriers a certain amount; but thus far that question has not been discussed with reference to paying them too much.

Gentlemen of the House, I hope and trust that we will show to the country that we are in favor of paying for services well done, paying such an amount for carrying the mail in the country as will insure prompt and efficient service. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some communications read from postmasters opposing the contract system, and I can understand why any partisan postmaster who has such a political pull under the present system would oppose any change. It has been said there is no demand for the contract system; that no one has requested it. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the way I consider it, it was not necessary for the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, whose duty it is to provide the best system for the delivery of the mail, to sit down and wait until they receive letters from the farmers about a system which is new and to which they have given but little attention as to the best method of carrying it on; but it was their duty, as that committee had charge of this subject, to consider it and present to this House their conclusions without waiting for requests from anyone.

I have received a letter from a gentleman who is not a postmaster, who speaks the opinion of a good many people on this question. I will not put his name in the RECORD for I am not authorized to do so, but I vouch for him as truthful and reliable, and a good citizen of his community. Writing on the 6th of March, he says:

I notice some discussion in Congress in relation to the method, etc., of "rural free-delivery" service. I trust you will see the advisability of putting this system on the contract basis. As it is to-day it is nothing more nor less than a political machine of the basest character. We have four rural free-delivery routes from this post-office. The carriers are usually loaded with political documents and "sample copies" of newspapers of the most rabid Republican type, and are constantly relating to the postmaster and to each other what a wonderful "hit" they made in an argument with some Democrat. I presume, however, that it is useless for me to tell you how the matter is conducted here, for I guess it is the same wherever there is such rural service. I trust you will do your very best to exterminate this most damnable and contemptible electioneering scheme.

And he adds:

All Republican newspapers by our newsdealer unsold, I am informed, are distributed by the carriers, as well as hundreds of other such documents, to the farmers along their respective routes.

It is not strange that the circulation of the daily newspapers is increasing. And, Mr. Chairman, to show that the complaint is not confined to Democrats alone, I refer to an article in the Washington Post of this morning—a special—embodying complaints by Republicans, charging that one of these route inspectors or special agents, surrounded and sanctified by the atmosphere of civil service [laughter]—the charge is made that he and other Federal officials have aligned themselves to renominate a certain man for Congress against another Republican candidate.

I will not designate the district; it would be unfair; for I have no doubt there are many others where similar influences are at work. So the complaint is not confined to Democrats, but it comes from Republicans as well. And you will see how this ground of complaint will grow in the future if you continue the present system.

I do not wish to discuss the star-route system. If there are any members of this House who, having heard the discussions and arguments here, have not yet discovered that the contract system provided in this bill is far different from the old star-route system, then no arguments can reach their case.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, on January 19, 1900, I introduced a bill into this House to cure some of the evils of the star-route contract system. I could never get that bill considered by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. But I notice now that the sinner has at last repented, and has incorporated my measure in this bill as virtually his own. The Post-Office Department at that time concluded that if I would not push that measure of mine they would originate a rule, and they did originate a rule, based upon the lines of this bill. A copy of that rule I now hold in my hand; and I find it has been incorporated in the pending measure.

But, Mr. Chairman, that does not end the trouble. The star-route business has been going on just the same. The parties interested in the star-route business from the State of Iowa, together with some parties in the District of Columbia, have been perpetrating the same frauds as willingly and as rapidly as ever. The evil does not cease. The rule of the Department is not enforced. The same swindling is going on to-day. The idea of compelling these contractors to live upon the route is not carried out and will not be if this contract system goes on.

I have listened to the learned discussions here and have witnessed some strange things. For instance, I have found out that the patriot of Illinois, "Uncle JOE CANNON," who has been in this House for twenty years, professed that he would like to put on an amendment here if he only knew how. He has since that declaration gone to night school, I presume, as he has availed himself of an opportunity to get in an amendment.

Gentlemen say here that we ought not to pay a salary of \$600 when we can get people under the contract system to do the service for less. But anyone who demands of the mail carrier that he shall render this service for less than \$600 knows that he will not get good service. By such a system you are undertaking to economize at the expense of people who can least afford to be thus treated. You do not hesitate here to spend money to build up corporations, to build up combinations of capital that can afford to pay half a million of dollars as a salary. How cheerfully you vote for a measure of that kind. You have never said "no" upon any of those propositions. Where does your economy fall? Upon those who can least afford to submit to cutting down—who only accept service at beggarly wages because they must take it or starve.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill recommended by the committee through its chairman. I have listened to the specious arguments presented by its advocates and tried to see if in any way possible, if by any interpretation of language, any combination of circumstances, the provisions of their bill would work out



to the benefit of the people who are interested in the success of free rural delivery, but it has been in vain. There is only menace to the service and a threat of injury to the patrons thereof by making the service inadequate and inefficient.

I am in favor of the rural delivery system. A great many city residents frequently get the idea into their heads that they are of more importance than the farmer or dweller in the country, but they are greatly mistaken. It may be that there is a greater accumulation of wealth in the city, but, man for man, in all that goes to make up the honor, character, virtue, and glory of our nation the country districts are far in the lead. In point of numbers, the population of all the cities with over 10,000 inhabitants is nearly balanced by the population of rural districts and smaller towns, and this second division are as justly entitled to the privileges of mail service, in all its extent, as are those who dwell within city limits.

Rural delivery is a great help in the building up of good roads. It is also a great educational force, in that it permits a wider and freer dissemination of literature and works of science and art. It offers the farmer the advantage of daily knowledge of the markets, and affords him opportunity to take advantage of the mail promptly. More letters are written, more papers taken, the registry and money-order business is enlarged, and in scores of ways it, in blessing, brings blessings in return. I would like to see the service extended until a network of routes should be established so that no home so remote, no family so isolated, but would be reached by the mail service. This is the perfection for which we should strive.

A start has been made, and the Post-Office Department is endeavoring to enlarge and expand the service, and the Department prefers to continue a system of carriers upon salary, which has been tried, no longer an experiment, but an acknowledged success, rather than to change to the antiquated system, which in this connection is an experiment and in other service has been honeycombed with annoyance, trouble, scandal, and fraud.

I believe it is our duty to treat city and country alike, giving each efficient mail service. Rural delivery is here to stay. So satisfactory has it been to the people wherever it has been instituted that from all parts of the country are coming petitions for the service. The trouble is that as the Department is handicapped by lack of funds it can not put a large enough force into the field to keep up with the demand. In my own district alone there are nearly a hundred petitions on file, not yet acted upon, and some of them over two years old. This is not the fault of the Department, as it is doing all it can, with its means, to meet and comply with the requests that are piling up day by day, but it is swamped by the enthusiastic reception of the system by the people.

The chairman of the committee says, as a reason why there should be a change and that instead of having a carrier on a salary of \$600 per annum the service must be performed under contract and the lowest bidder get the job, that if it is not done the carriers will form a union and ask for more pay, and threaten us with their vengeance if we vote against their request. Now, isn't that just awful! Intimidation, coercion, and violence! Perhaps they will. Perhaps, as they will undoubtedly all be men of intelligence, they may read history and recall how in 1896, and again in 1900, the banking trusts and all the great syndicates and corporations threatened the workingmen with dire vengeance if they did not vote as their employers dictated. The gentleman from California has not forgotten the Republican campaign methods and is afraid the carriers will steal their thunder. But even if they should make this threat, how insignificant it would be, with their 50,000 or even 100,000 strength, when contrasted with the threat of one trust, or of the Pacific Railroad Company. The chairman of the committee is a good Republican, a stalwart of the stalwarts, and yet in his advocacy of this bill his zeal for his star-route friends seems to have overcome his discretion and betrayed him into some queer statements and revelations.

He says that the appointment of these rural carriers has heretofore been one of the perquisites of Congressmen as political patronage. This may be true of the Republicans, but the pie counter has been closed to the Democrats. The system is now under the classified civil-service list, and yet from this Republican witness we have the statement that it is "whispered" that patronage will not be disturbed; that Congressmen—that is, Republican Congressmen—may have the naming of the rural carriers in their districts in spite of the civil-service rules. Hence, therefore, according to his argument, vote for his bill!

I have said before, and I repeat, I am not a believer in the civil-service system as it has been conducted. It is a delusion and a fraud. It is a door that a key does not open, but yields to the pressure of a hidden secret spring. Merit is not to count, but the "promised" dispenser of party patronage will control appointments. Is not this an interesting sample of Republican honesty, as viewed by the gentlemanly chairman?

The rural mail service is of Democratic parentage, and is the

outcome of Mr. Wilson's efforts in its behalf. Under Democratic administration it was economically and ably conducted; the carriers received \$300 per year, and no complaints were heard. "But," continues the gentleman from California, "the Department came into the hands of the Republican party, and now it has grown to be the most extravagant bureau ever organized." Now, this is good Republican testimony, but I do not think the gentleman intended to speak so frankly. He was thinking only of making the change to a contract system—a system where, perhaps, there might not be as much political patronage, but where greater fraud and corruption could come in.

These speculators in star-route contracts have watched with amazement and fear the growth of the rural service system, and with greedy longing have sought to bring it within the grasp of their malodorous ring. You all know how under a former administration certain officials in high places, having too much love for certain people, shared with the favored contractors in amassing fortunes illegally obtained from the Government. As a system, the contract method of having our mail carried has been most pernicious, rotten, and unsatisfactory, and it would seem that the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads are seeking to discredit the rural service and bring it into disrepute. We may judge the future from the past.

Human nature is the same to-day as it was yesterday, and it will be the same in the future. It is true the committee has tried to surround their bill with apparent safeguards. They have added a provision contained in a bill which I introduced in the House on January 19, 1900, and could never get the worthy chairman of the committee to consider, and they say that the bidder must be "a legal and actual resident of the district or territory in which the proposed service is to be performed," but this does not make the contract method desirable. The lowest responsible bidder is to get the job, and then, independent of Government control, the service will run down, and the last stage of the system will be worse than any in its history.

The main plea put forth for this virtual abandonment of the present system is the expense of the salaried carrier. The advocates of the bill in one breath say that the salaries of these rural carriers may two or three years from now amount to fifty or sixty millions of dollars. Well, why not? This is one of the few Departments of the Government that comes in close relations to the individual and is of service to the people, a Department run as a business and through its receipts is almost self-sustaining. Now, why single out this Department and talk about its expense, yet say nothing of its revenues. Just look at our Army and Navy departments. See the millions of dollars we are paying out in a war from which we do not derive a single penny in return; why, we are not even getting glory. A war in which not a single element of patriotism or love of country is involved, but simply the exploitation of the schemes of a favored few; for this my friend will vote to pay out not \$15,000,000 or \$60,000,000, but hundreds of millions, and then talk about the expense of from 8,000 to 60,000 rural mail carriers. Oh, be consistent!

I have not the slightest doubt but that it will cost an immense sum when the free rural-delivery system is fully developed, but in the light of past experience the postal receipts will be largely increased, but even if they were not, I would far rather prefer the money being paid to carry the mail to all the people of this country than to maintain an offensive, oppressive, bloody, inhuman warfare against a people contending for freedom, whose motto is "For God and our native land," as this country is doing now.

If it be true that under the contract system the routes will be shorter, and therefore the pay less, it will be offset by the fact that the number of routes will be increased, and thus the total cost will be greater.

The amount paid the rural carrier—\$600—is none too much to pay the class of men it is the aim of the Department to keep in the service, and who are capable of meeting the responsibilities and performing the duties of that position; and yet it is not the interests of the few carriers or contractors that should be mainly considered. It is, How shall the people be best served? They are satisfied now. There is no demand coming from anywhere for a change except from the committee room and from the horde of hungry contractors, who are longing to get a chance to make another raid on the Treasury.

The people want no change; they only want more routes under the present plan. The Department is satisfied, and the able superintendent of the rural system, who has given much thought and study to the service, and is as well, perhaps better, informed upon the comparative merits of the two methods, advocates the continuance of the present way of having salaried carriers, as better service is rendered, better discipline maintained, and a higher class of carriers secured.

It is again the question as to the relative merits of a contract or a salaried system, and the question time and again has been decided adversely to contractors.



To show the absurdity of the contention, it is only necessary to follow the proposition out to its logical conclusion. If the contract system is good, is the best for the rural carrier, it is the best for the city carrier, for all the employees in the other great departments of the Government, and for the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of the Government; carry it into business houses, into schools, and into the churches. Why, the bare suggestion refutes the assertion and claims for the system.

The advocates of the bill are alarmed lest the carriers should have political ideas and influence. It is the prerogative of any American citizen to exercise his political right, and to forbid the exercise of that right is un-American.

The idea or suggestion that these carriers will immediately besiege Congress for increased salary is a chimera, is crossing the bridge before it is reached, and a virtual confession at the outset that they are illy and insufficiently paid, and is unworthy of the men who, having the respect and confidence of their neighbors, have been recommended by them for appointment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. THOMPSON] have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to have the attention of the committee for five minutes. There are now nearly 8,000 carriers who have their equipments. It would not be just or proper to turn them over to the contract system until they had been employed a reasonable time. I will not vote for any proposition that would do that. If we are to have the present system and no contracts, then, as I said a little bit ago, I am in favor of at least a thousand dollars pay. This bill so far fixes it at \$600, but an amendment has been offered that gentlemen think would enable the carrier to earn the other \$400. I hope it will. If it does not, then later on I would favor legislation to give the carrier the other \$400 by way of compensation from the Government.

Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is offered, as I understand it, to make it the duty of the Postmaster-General to try the experiment, not on any routes now existing, but on a limited number of routes to be established, to let them under the contract system, with a provision that one man can have only one contract, that he must be competent, and must live on the route. In my judgment that amendment is wise, because what we all want is to get an effective system for the people. I am not sure myself that the contract system is the best, but this tries the experiment; and, in my judgment, in all good faith, without any partisanship on this question, we ought to try every experiment that may be a success, now, while we can, because the Postmaster-General tells us that in six years from this time from 45,000 to 50,000 carriers will be employed, and their total compensation will no doubt be from \$45,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

Now, it will do nobody any harm. It will not harm those who are in the service if we adopt this amendment. It will not apply to any route upon which the service is now established, and with the bent of the Post-Office Department it will not apply on very many of the routes to be established between this and January. Now, in view of this great service, having a common interest with everybody else, it does seem to me that we ought not to be stampeded, without using every means within our power to get the best service for all the people at a reasonable cost, in a service that inside of six years must cost us \$50,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has been offered in good faith, I have no doubt, but it is intended as the entering wedge to put into the hand of the Postmaster-General the power, if he is hostile to the salary system, virtually to destroy what this committee has already said should be done. It puts a weapon in his hands which will enable him to do that if he is hostile to the salary system.

In a great many parts of this country the contract mail service of the United States, as to the horses and wagons and the service rendered by people, is a disgrace to this Government. If you put these rural free-delivery routes under contract, I do not care if a man is allowed to take only one, what will be the result?

Take a route for which a man ought to have six or seven hundred dollars, and for that route some fellow with an old horse and wagon, who, perhaps, has been on his uppers for six or seven months, will offer to carry that mail for two, three, or four hundred dollars, or for less than any man who is fit to be in the service can carry it. It will be the old story. Have you not had trouble about men of this kind, who will undertake this service and go ahead for five or six months and then throw up their route and put their bondsmen in trouble to find substitutes or carry the mails themselves?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the contract service has been tried over and over, and we are trying it to-day, and I say two-thirds of that

service is a disgrace to this Government in the rural districts. We have had the free rural carriers at a salary of \$500 a year. All over my country we have magnificent, costly wagons, with the words "Free rural delivery, Route No. 1" or "No. 2, United States mail," with good horses, and they have been rendering to the people a service that is entirely satisfactory.

The people living in the rural districts do not want any of your contract service, because they have recently got rid of a contract service which was not satisfactory.

You talk about the expense of 50,000 carriers. This country could better afford to have 80,000 rural carriers with a salary of \$600 a year than to have 50,000 contractors.

I am opposed to this amendment. I do not know how the present Postmaster-General stands on this question; I do not know how his successor may stand; but if he is hostile to putting carriers on a fixed salary, under the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] he can experiment along the line which he is in favor of and he can destroy the system as it exists to-day.

You talk about paying the bills. The people of the United States in the rural districts want to be put in contact with the world, and they want the best service they can get. They want it as good as the people in the cities have. This Congress can pass no legislation that will come closer to the people than to provide for the delivery of the mail to them in this way. I am not afraid of the expense. When you give the men who pay the taxes the benefit of the delivery of mail right at their doors, there will be no bill to be paid that will be met more graciously than the bill for the carriers' salary. Now, I hope those who are in favor of rural carriers at \$600 a year will vote this amendment down.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, is any additional amendment in order under this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Then I desire to send to the desk the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment offered by Mr. LACEY by adding thereto the following:

"Provided, That the Postmaster-General shall not advertise for such proposals or make such awards for any route in operation at the date of the passage of this act until July 1, 1906, or until a vacancy shall occur by reason of the death, resignation, or removal of the carrier who may be serving on any such route at the date of the passage of this act."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is that amendment in order at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HILL. There is a motion to strike out?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a motion to strike out and an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is subject to amendment.

Mr. HILL. And this is an amendment to that substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there is great concern on the part of many of the members of the House with reference to the retention of the carriers already in the service. It has been manifested in many of the remarks that have been made that this service is a permanent service and that the object which we should have in connection with it is to try to secure the best methods by which these carriers shall be selected. I am certainly in favor of trying the experiment of the contract system, but I do not want it done at the expense of any of the carriers who are now in the service, and the object of my amendment is that the two may go together, that all of the routes now in operation shall have their carriers retained until 1906, which will give them four years from July 1, or until July 1, 1906.

Within that time the contract system can be easily and fully settled—whether it will or will not be a success—and I believe that if we are going to try the contract system at all—to authorize the Postmaster-General to do that—that we should adopt this amendment, which will absolutely keep the present system in existence, and let the contract system, or an experiment of the contract system, apply only to routes hereafter to be established. I do not see that any man can object to this character of an amendment. It is a safeguard for the present system; it is a safeguard to those now in the service. It may be said that the Postmaster-General would not interfere if this permission was given him to try the contract system, that he would not interfere with the routes already in force and effect.

Well, possibly he would not; but it will be no reflection upon his integrity and his honor for us to provide by this amendment, as I seek to do, that the present service and the carriers in it shall not be disturbed before July 1, 1906, and that he shall not let to contract or accept any bid for the same on the routes in effect on



the day of the passage of this act until July 1, 1906. I hope the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. KLUTTZ. The gentleman wants to try this experiment in the districts of those of us who have no routes?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Not at all. It may be on some routes established in my district, or the districts of other gentlemen, and upon those this experiment can be tried just the same as in the districts of those gentlemen who have none.

[Mr. BLACKBURN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, the long debate upon this bill has demonstrated one fact beyond a peradventure, and that is that this House is unanimously in favor of the free rural delivery service; and if we represent the entire people we may now take it for granted that they are in favor of an extension to its utmost capacity of this valuable and popular service. That is a strong point made. There are men about me now, perhaps some in this Congress, who remember that forty years ago when the question of free delivery in cities came up in Congress it met with opposition from all quarters.

It was called an expensive, unnecessary, and extravagant service. To-day we realize the benefits that the free-delivery service in the cities has conferred upon this country. Six years ago, when the rural free-delivery service was first started, there were those who were highly sceptical as to its practicability and ultimate benefit. We have at last come to the point, Mr. Chairman, when the whole country and the representatives of all the people are committed to the establishment and to the furthest possible extension of this service. On that point we are all agreed. The Department estimates that with this system extended to take in the entire country there will be some 50,000 routes.

Now, I submit in all candor to those gentlemen who advocate the salary system whether, when this entire country is covered, we shall not have a great diversity of routes, not only in length but in the cost of service. We can not cover the entire country with routes that will be uniform either in mileage, in hours necessary to complete the service, or in the cost of living and maintenance of equipment.

The point I want to impress on the committee is this: That those who are in favor of the fullest possible extension of the service must admit that when it is extended to cover the entire population, we shall have not uniform routes but a great diversity of routes.

Now, if that is so, \$600 as an annual compensation to a man on the more expensive routes, who must furnish his own horse and wagon, is utterly inadequate and ought not to receive the approval of the House. A four-hundred dollar net compensation in New England and generally in the northern parts of this country, where living and the maintenance of equipment are expensive, is entirely inadequate. It will be impossible to maintain routes in the Rocky Mountain region at such a figure. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that unless we provide to-day for some method by which the Department may at least test and report to us on the workings of the contract system we shall fail to act for the best interests of the rural free-delivery service.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that on a uniform-salary basis this free-delivery service will be broken right in two in the middle, and we shall not be able to carry the service over the entire country. As I have said, a salary of \$600 a year would be entirely inadequate in some parts of the country while entirely ample in others; entirely inadequate on some routes while entirely adequate on other routes in the same vicinity.

The House has expressed its preference to-day for the salary system. What I wish to urge upon the friends of this service—and there are no better friends of the extension of the service than the members of the committee who advocate the contract system—is that we give to the head of the Post-Office Department the necessary authority to give a limited number of routes a fair test under this contract system and report his conclusions to some subsequent Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House briefly—and I shall not take up the five minutes—to one proposition that has been advanced, and that is that the Post-Office Department should have discretion in the matter. Absolute discretion is given the Department, and to hold its own grip over the whole thing, under the original amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Virginia, because there the Postmaster-General has authority to award these routes at a salary not to exceed \$600 a year. If he has a chance to try a new route in a new part of the country at a salary of \$300 a year, it is his privilege to do it. If he wishes to try it at \$200 or \$400 or \$500, he has that privilege. Under authority given by that amendment provided by the gentleman from Virginia not only can he practically experiment if he chooses, but he can hold his grip on the situation, which he absolutely loses by advertising for proposals.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do I understand that the amendment to which the gentleman refers has already been adopted?

Mr. HILL. Yes; and no further amendment is needed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do I understand that the amendment permits the Postmaster-General under a salaried system to pay one salary in Connecticut and another in Mississippi?

Mr. HILL. I understand the fullest discretion is given the Postmaster-General to pay a salary at a sum not exceeding \$600.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then the Postmaster-General will have the discretion to pay one salary in Connecticut and another in Mississippi.

Mr. HILL. He has always had that discretion ever since this system has been established. This proposition simply continues for one year more precisely the practice that has existed heretofore.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then I want to give notice—

Mr. HILL. I can not allow my time to be taken up further.

There is another reason why this measure should not be adopted, and that is that you are mixing up two systems; you are putting a civil-service system and a noncivil-service system side by side. This would not work so badly if you would put carriers on the two kinds of service at points remote from each other. But for one I do not want a contract given in my district which will make the carriers there dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction would inevitably exist on both sides—among the contractors and among the carriers. It would be a mistake to put the two classes of employees, the contract man and the salaried man, side by side—a great mistake. I submit it would be a great mistake to undertake this experimental system.

But if the Postmaster-General is authorized to experiment within the lines of the bill as now drawn—

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. But he is not so authorized.

Mr. HILL. He absolutely is.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. You do not say so. You say you say so, but you do not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Connecticut allow me a moment?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is it not a fact that ever since this service was started different salaries have been paid in different places?

Mr. HILL. Certainly, not only in different parts of the country, but in the same county. Here are hundreds of cases, memoranda of which I have before me, where there are variations of salary, the salaries running at \$250, \$275, \$350, \$400, and so on. This has been the practice of the Department for some years past.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What I want to know is whether under this amendment the Postmaster-General would have the discretion to pay one salary in one part of the country and another salary in another part of the country. If he is to have such discretion, I want to serve notice that, whether a Mississippian makes more money out of this system or less, I shall insist, if the salary system is to be established, that all the people who are doing the same service shall receive the same compensation.

Mr. HILL. The Postmaster-General for six years has had the authority to use his discretion in this matter; and he has used it not only in different parts of the country but in the same part of the country, the compensation varying according to the character of the route—whether hilly or level, mountainous or plain. It is a discretion to pay whatever the service may be worth within the allowance of \$600.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Connecticut yielded to me just now, but I was interrupted. Now, right on that point I want to refer the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to page 116 of the report of the Postmaster-General for 1900, where he shows that he has allowed different salaries on different routes because some routes are level, with good roads, and others are mountainous, with rough roads. In 1896 we paid \$150 and afterwards \$300. In 1898 we paid \$400 and July 1, 1900, we paid \$500. These figures can be found at page 116 of the Postmaster-General's report for 1900.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that debate on the pending paragraph be closed.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Before that motion—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Before that motion is put I wish to remind the gentleman from Virginia that I have an amendment I want to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The closing of debate will not preclude the offering of amendments.



Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. But I wish to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to close debate on the pending paragraph. The question being taken, there were—ayes 69, noes 52.

Mr. LACEY. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. LACEY and Mr. SWANSON were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 50.

So the motion of Mr. SWANSON to close debate was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Illinois was rejected, there being—ayes 19, noes 73.

Mr. FLEMING rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING] wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. FLEMING. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding after the word "select" in line 3, the words, "not exceeding 45 in number." So as to read: "Provided, That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to test the practicability of performing the rural free-delivery service by contract, on such newly established routes as he may select not exceeding 45 in number, etc."

Mr. FLEMING. I simply want to make it experimental, so that there shall be no mistake about that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman who offered the amendment if what he proposes is not being done under the present system?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the committee will indulge me for a minute. Did not the gentleman from California state—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to address the committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I simply want to ask one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I must be impartial, and I shall have to object to any unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

The question being taken, on a division, demanded by Mr. LACEY, there were—ayes 54, noes 92.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMALL. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add the following:

"The Postmaster-General shall establish rural free-delivery service in the several States in the proportion, or as near as may be, which the rural population of each State shall bear to the aggregate of the rural population in all the States, and the same ratio shall be observed as far as practicable in the establishment of such service in the several Congressional districts of each State: *Provided*, That if the applications on file for such service from any State or district are not sufficient to enable the Postmaster-General to maintain the ratio herein provided, then he may establish the service in other States, observing the same ratio as far as may be practicable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SMALL. Is debate in order upon the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed by order of the committee.

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division, demanded by Mr. SMALL, there were—ayes 50, noes 94.

Mr. SMALL. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. SMALL and Mr. LOUD.

Mr. SMALL. I ask that the amendment be again read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 96.

Accordingly, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second. That no additional compensation shall be allowed to a rural free-delivery carrier unless pursuant to an advertisement and award of service as herein provided.

Mr. SWANSON. I move to strike out that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] moves to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I move to amend that by striking out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I gave notice the other day under general debate that I would offer an amendment providing that no person should be designated as carrier on any route until he filed with the Department a certificate signed by a majority of the bona fide patrons of the route that his designation as carrier would not be objectionable to them. I believe that the people along the routes ought to have a veto power against any objectionable or distasteful carrier. I stated that with that, and with one other amendment, I would favor the contract system as preferable to the present system.

I object to the present system, because in my judgment it leaves the power in the Post-Office Department to reject any carrier and to appoint anyone it sees fit. It is true that the Department has adopted certain regulations in the nature of civil-service rules, and if your inspector performs his duty under the law the people will get good service under it. Yet the inspector has almost an absolute and unlimited power to so report his examination as to select any man he wants as carrier. But, Mr. Chairman, I want a new system in order that the States in the South may get their proper share of this service.

I stated the other day that in the Republican State of Iowa more routes had been established than in the entire eight States from the Potomac River to the Texas line. Afterwards it was suggested that I ought to have stated the number of applications which had been filed from those various States. If you will establish one route in a neighborhood or in a county, immediately thereafter many applications will be sent in from that county. The establishment of a route brings forth the application for more routes.

Mr. GRAFF. Suppose that a majority of the patrons of a route happen to be colored people. Would your measure allow the appointment of a colored carrier for that route?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I see the point of the gentleman's question, and the gentleman will understand that I said "bona fide patrons." The Department could very properly hold that a bona fide patron must be a regular subscriber to some paper, secular or religious, or part owner of a box or something like that. I think the majority of the bona fide patrons ought to have a voice in the selection of carriers.

Mr. GRAFF. Anybody would be a bona fide patron who was eligible to receive mail.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Well, we deny that, and I very much regret that the gentleman insists on injecting the race question into this subject. It is very unfortunate. One would not be a patron who neither sends nor receives mail, just as one is not the patron of a school who does not send to it, although he lives in the district. However, I do not want my attention distracted from this proposition. I want to read some figures to the House which I am sure will enlighten gentlemen.

Mr. TOMPKINS of New York. Would you regard a colored man who was in the habit of receiving letters as a bona fide patron?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. If he was in the regular habit of it, yes. If he was a customary receiver or a customary sender of mail, yes.

Mr. TOMPKINS of New York. Good.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the eight States I named the other day there had been 500 routes established on February 1. I count as established routes which had then been ordered to be established.

In those States there had been 1,745 applications filed, showing that 28 per cent of the applications had been favorably acted upon. In the State of Iowa there had been 1,461 applications and 718 establishments, showing 49 per cent. In the State of Ohio there had been 1,503 applications and 677 establishments, a percentage of 45.

Here is a list of States in which there have been applications only exceeding by three those from the eight States that I named; but these States, which have solid Republican delegations in this House and in the Senate, from which 1,748 applications have been filed, have had 1,081 establishments made, or a percentage of 62.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.  
Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The States to which I referred are (in this list I count as established those which were ordered):

State.	Applica- tion.	Estab- lished.	Per cent.
California.....	150	96	64
Connecticut.....	165	114	69
Maine.....	161	106	65
New Hampshire.....	121	94	77
Rhode Island.....	23	15	65
Vermont.....	113	70	62
Maryland.....	236	193	81
North Dakota.....	31	18	58
Washington.....	51	37	72
Wisconsin.....	697	338	48
Total.....	1,748	1,081	62

These States have 39 Congressional districts.

Now, let us see how the percentage runs down in the States I named:

State.	Applica- tions.	Estab- lished.	Per cent.
Virginia.....	205	69	33
North Carolina.....	398	64	16
South Carolina.....	319	140	44
Georgia.....	641	175	27
Alabama.....	133	43	32
Mississippi.....	34	3	9
Louisiana.....	10	5	50
Florida.....	5	1	20
Total.....	1,745	500	28

These States have 61 Congressional districts. The pamphlet to which I have referred contains figures which show that on February 1 there had been established throughout all the States, except the eight Southern States named, 47 per cent, or nearly one-half, of the routes for which applications had been filed.

Now, you can easily see why I favor some change in the system. Our people want this rural free delivery. We are anxious for it, and with this amendment, which I shall offer as a separate paragraph, I believe we can have satisfactory routes.

I call attention to this percentage in the belief that it may have something to do with the increase of routes in my section, and will enable us to get a more impartial service than we now get under the civil-service regulations as promulgated by the Department. Let us have more inspectors or special agents in the South, so that our people can be supplied with the service. Increase the number of inspectors, if necessary.

Another thing. I have been informed that other gentlemen in my State have been allowed to name a part of the carriers. I have named perhaps a majority of those who are to-day carrying the mail in my district; yet I understand throughout the North and West that the rule was to give all these routes to the Republicans prior to February 1.

Under the present rules a member of Congress has nothing and can have nothing to do with the naming of carriers, if they are honestly enforced. But prior to February 1, 1902, while in my State Democratic Representatives were permitted to name one-half of the carriers, and while in other States in the South, where Republicans have no hope of success, Democrats have been permitted to name all the carriers, yet in the States in the North and West, where some districts are close, Democratic members of Congress have not been permitted to have any voice whatever in the selection of carriers. These facts tell the tale of partisanship, and possibly explain in part why so many routes have been established in those sections.

Mr. TIRRELL. Have you investigated as to Massachusetts to see how many routes there are there?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will not be diverted from the important argument that he is now making.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Yes; I have the figures as to Massachusetts. In Massachusetts 123 petitions have been received and 75 routes established—a percentage of 61. Very good for Massachusetts to get routes on 61 per cent of the applications filed.

Now, the very fact that so many Republicans have been appointed in these other sections of the country convinces me, with my knowledge of human nature and political parties, that unless some change is made in this system that it will be used as a great political machine for whichever party is in charge of the Administration. The people of the mountain section of the

South already know the influence the revenue officers—the gaugers and storekeepers and deputy marshals and collectors—have used in politics, not only on the country at large, but upon the selection of their own party nominees. We have felt that influence. Acting upon our experience, I see a great danger in the 50,000 free rural-delivery carriers that we may have hereafter going through the country daily, partly in the interest of the Administration. I believe that there ought to be proper protection and safeguards thrown around the system, and we ought to change the present to a better system. [Applause.]

Mr. SALMON. I now offer the amendment that I sent to the desk, which I ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 8, page 3, the following:

"Hereafter if the petitioners applying for the establishment of a rural free-delivery route shall request that the carrier be selected upon the contract principle, the Postmaster-General shall make such selection in manner as follows:

"First. That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on any mail rural free-delivery route the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days, in a conspicuous place accessible to the public in the post-office from which the mail is to be carried, inviting proposals, in such form as he may prescribe, for the service to be performed."

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order that this is not germane to the paragraph. It provides an entirely different system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could hardly rule until he has heard the amendment read.

Mr. HILL. It is perfectly apparent so far as it has been read that it does not apply to the additional compensation for carriers already chosen, and is not germane to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to rule that the point of the gentleman from Connecticut is well taken, but the Chair is inclined to the opinion that this will be permissible as a separate paragraph.

Mr. HILL. But it would only be in order as a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order at this time. The gentleman will withdraw it temporarily until after this paragraph has been disposed of. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey now offers the paragraph preceding line 19, page 2, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 8, page 3, the following:

"Hereafter if the petitioners applying for the establishment of a rural free-delivery route shall request that the carrier be selected upon the contract principle the Postmaster-General shall make such selection in manner as follows:

"First. That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on any mail rural free-delivery route the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days in a conspicuous place accessible to the public."

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order that it can not be read until we have read down to line 19. The gentleman offers it as an amendment to three paragraphs, and it can not be read until we have read to line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman offers it as a separate paragraph.

Mr. HILL. He offers it as a substitute for a portion of the bill which has not yet been read.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is so, then it is not in order. It is offered as a separate paragraph. The gentleman stated that over and over again.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman offers it as a substitute, but it is for a part of the bill down to line 19, and we have not read down to line 19.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Preceding line 19.

Mr. SWANSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, section 2 has been struck out?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman means paragraph 2.

Mr. SWANSON. Paragraph 2.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been struck out.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand it, paragraph 3 in the bill is in order. Is it in order to offer a separate paragraph at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it attaches to the bill as a separate paragraph.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that we should complete the bill before a separate paragraph is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that a separate paragraph does not necessarily go to the end of the bill. The Chair thinks that this amendment is obviously germane.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that if it is offered to attach to something, it ought to be attached to something that has been read. The position I take is that if the gentleman desires a distinctive proposition controlling rural free delivery in addition to



what is contained in the bill, he ought to offer it as a separate proposition after the bill of the committee is disposed of. I do not see to what it attaches until we complete the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the paragraph which the gentleman offers is plainly germane to the bill and can be introduced as a separate paragraph, but the Chair is of the opinion, as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia, that it would be more appropriate and more regular and much better if the paragraph was offered after the subject which is treated of here has been acted upon by the House; that is, after sections 3 and 4 have been disposed of. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from New Jersey that he withdraw his amendment and renew it again, which will prevent all question.

Mr. SALMON. I will do so, Mr. Chairman. I really thought that this paragraph had been disposed of.

The Clerk read as follows:

Third. That under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may prescribe, a substitute carrier may be employed, at the expense of the regular carrier, to temporarily perform the service on any rural free-delivery mail route.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia what his object is? Does not the gentleman want authority to employ a substitute?

Mr. SWANSON. I think the present civil-service rules provide that the carrier may select his own substitute.

Mr. LOUD. The civil-service rules are not law.

Mr. SWANSON. They are law when promulgated by the President, and the President can not revoke them. It has been so held by a test case in the Supreme Court. My objection to this paragraph is that there would be a conflict as to whether the civil-service rules should prevail in connection with the appointment of a substitute or whether it should be left entirely with the Postmaster-General. I think, to have a harmonious system, it would be better to let the carrier select the substitute, and when the substitute comes up for appointment under the civil-service rules—when a carrier is removed—the carrier will be selected just as a carrier for a new route. I want to say, in connection with the civil-service rules, that the best authorities hold that when the President has put a department under the civil service he has not the power to take that department out from under it again.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It has been done, however.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not believe he can do it; and if this was to be in the law, there would be a question whether the control of the substitute was left to the civil service or whether it would be left by this bill to the Postmaster-General, and consequently I think the system would be more in consonance with harmony to have this provision struck out.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that the House may be in a frame of mind to do something to-day that they may be sorry for to-morrow, when their better judgment comes. If you do not enact this provision, then there will be no law to permit the appointment of a substitute. I care nothing about the civil-service rules; you have no statute that will permit the appointment of a substitute. Without a statute, after we put this service under the statutory law and segregate and provide for it, I say that the Postmaster-General, notwithstanding the civil-service rules, would not be authorized to permit the employment of a substitute. Now, gentlemen, let us not lose our heads on this proposition.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not want to.

Mr. LOUD. I think the gentleman has lost his. The civil service can not promulgate statutory law; they can not make a new office. Heretofore, under the lump-sum appropriation, where we gave the Department three million or four million dollars, they could expend this money as they saw fit. But here we propose to appropriate a specific sum of money for inspectors, a specific sum for carriers; and now if you have no statutes that permit the appointment of a substitute, you are repudiating the substitute carrier because the law itself does not mention any such officer, and, not being mentioned, it is prohibited by law. The gentleman from Virginia and his followers can strike it out if they want to, but they will have no statute authorizing a substitute carrier.

[Mr. SMALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, the object of my amendment is to prevent any lack of harmony in the rural carrier system. The rules promulgated by the Civil Service Commission, of which Mr. Procter is president, contain this provision with reference to providing substitutes in the rural free-delivery service:

18. A carrier will be required to furnish a suitable substitute. Whenever a carrier becomes separated from the service the postmaster shall employ the substitute carrier, if there be one at the time, and if not, any suitable person until regular appointment can be made. The appointment of a new carrier shall operate to separate the former substitute from the service, the new carrier to furnish his own substitute as herein provided.

Now, as I understand, when it is necessary to fill a vacancy in the position of a carrier the substitute has to undergo the same examination as if a new carrier were appointed.

Mr. HAY. By what authority can the Civil Service Commission create an office?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, in reference to that I will say that this Commission has issued rules and regulations governing the entire rural delivery—putting the entire appropriation and the employees under the civil service.

If gentlemen who have studied the question more thoroughly than I have are satisfied that there will be no chance for the appointment of a substitute unless this bill passes I am willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What is the gentleman's objection to this provision for substitute carriers?

Mr. SWANSON. My only objection is that I prefer the substitute carrier should be named by the carrier himself under civil-service rules as promulgated than that the Postmaster-General should name him.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman from Virginia that a few days ago they reversed the return of one of the supervisors because he did recommend the appointment of a substitute and put a substitute in office.

Mr. SWANSON. I withdraw my motion, as gentlemen who have examined the subject tell me that the Civil Service Commission would not without authority take action of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SALMON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter if the petitioners applying for the establishment of a rural free-delivery route shall request that the carrier be selected upon the contract principle, the Postmaster-General shall make such selection in manner as follows:

First. That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on any mail rural free-delivery route, the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days, in a conspicuous place accessible to the public, in the post-office from which the mail is to be carried, inviting proposals, in such form as he may prescribe, for the service to be performed. The service shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who shall furnish evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster-General that such bidder is a legal and actual resident of the district or territory in which the proposed service is to be performed; that he is a reliable and trustworthy person, of good moral character, able to read and write, and having sufficient intelligence and ability to properly perform the service, and who shall tender sufficient guaranties that he will personally perform acceptable service; but the Postmaster-General may reject all proposals submitted under any advertisement. *Provided*, That no person shall be awarded a contract for more than one route under this paragraph.

Second. That no additional compensation shall be allowed to a rural free-delivery carrier unless pursuant to an advertisement and award of service as herein provided.

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order that this amendment is not in order. If it is, I should like to know to what paragraph it applies.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order as an amendment, but is offered as a separate paragraph. The Chair wishes to state to the Committee of the Whole that at the suggestion of the Chair the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SALMON] withdrew this amendment when he offered it to paragraph 3. That paragraph having been continued in the bill, the proper place for the amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, is before that section, the point at which the gentleman offered it. The Chair suggests that unanimous consent be given that the amendment may be offered at that point. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand how anyone who is in favor of leaving questions, political or otherwise, to the majority of those interested can object to the passage of this paragraph. You have denied the selection of the carriers to those who are in a general way the selectors of the carriers under the contract system; but where the petitioners for a route specially ask that the carrier be selected on the contract principle, it seems to me there can be no possible objection to listening to the request of such petitioners.

In my belief, the time will come when all these carriers will be selected in the way proposed by this bill as it came from the committee, for it is the only just and proper way of making this selection. Who can know better what it is worth to carry the mail in a certain neighborhood than the people who are living in that neighborhood, and the great variation in the value of the services in different neighborhoods is such that you can not do justice to the carriers unless you pay them what they agree upon and are willing to do the service for.

It does not mean, as has been indicated on this floor in the arguments that have been made, that you will have a cheap service. It has no such intention as that, but it is to have a service performed by those who perform it at a price that they are willing to do it for and not at a price to be fixed arbitrarily by some one sent into that neighborhood from the Post-Office Department here. I believe that this paragraph will add very much to the



benefits that are to be derived under this measure, and that the rural free delivery will be more easily established and be more satisfactory to the people throughout the country if this system is adopted.

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, replying to the gentleman from Georgia, I want to call his attention to the fact that the privileges that are given to the discharged Union soldiers in the way of preference in public employment limits that preference and that privilege to those who have been disabled and discharged by reason thereof from the service.

I take it, therefore, that even if a preference was attempted to be extended to the Union soldiers, or for that matter to the ex-Confederate soldiers, to bring them within that class they would have to be utterly unfitted for this rural free-delivery service.

A MEMBER. To what amendment is the gentleman speaking?

Mr. BROMWELL. I have attempted on the floor of this House to secure an extension of that preferential bill to include all soldiers and sailors, as well as those who by reason of wounds or disease were discharged from the Army. And I venture to say that many of the gentlemen who are now agonizing over the amendment that I offered, putting the colored man of the South upon the same footing—

Mr. BARTLETT. Why confine it to the South?

Mr. BROMWELL (continuing). Were among the members who voted against the proposition that I submitted in the last Congress. I have no sympathy, Mr. Chairman, with this proposition, that because a man's skin is dark colored he shall not stand upon the same footing as the other people in this country.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BROMWELL. I have no sympathy with the idea that in the South the negro shall not only be debarred of his political rights, but that he shall not be permitted to earn an honest livelihood in the Government service, and, therefore, when I heard the gentleman on the other side propose to put the ex-Confederate soldiers upon the same footing with the ex-Union soldier, I felt that justice demanded that the colored man of the South should have his show as well as the ex-Confederate soldier.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did you confine it to the colored man of the South? Did you not say "colored men?"

Mr. BROMWELL. The colored man of the North has no trouble. He gets his rights. [Applause on the Republican side and derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOX. You shot them in Illinois when they wanted to get work. Instead of giving them employment you shot them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And you hung them in Indiana the other day after the jury had acquitted them.

Mr. BROMWELL. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that they do not hang them in that State and they do not shoot them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They did hang the defendant negro the other day in Indiana, after the jury had acquitted him.

Mr. BROMWELL. They have a punishment for them worse than hanging or shooting in Tennessee. They compel them to listen to the gentleman from Tennessee, and if that is not worse than hanging I do not know what is. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They would not listen to the gentleman from Ohio anywhere, and you could not force the members of this House to do so if we could help ourselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. I wish to ask the gentleman a respectful question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a respectful question.

Mr. BROMWELL. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Ohio said something about hanging negroes in the South. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if about two years ago the people of Urbana, Ohio, did not hang a negro who had been tried and convicted of an assault upon a white woman after he had been tried and convicted?

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes; and they hang white men all over the North for the same kind of an offense. They make no discrimination in the North; but they do in the South.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HILL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Repre-

sentatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announcing that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 6, 1902:

H. R. 10308. An act to provide for a permanent Census Office.

On March 8, 1902:

H. R. 5838. An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

On March 10, 1902:

H. R. 3740. An act to confirm title to lot 1, square 1113, in Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 61. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at Bogue Inlet, North Carolina;

H. R. 10070. An act establishing a United States court at Catlettsburg, in the eastern district of Kentucky;

H. R. 8180. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Derby; and

H. R. 5801. An act to authorize the St. Clair Terminal Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River.

#### RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] is in the condition of the average fellow who finds himself in a hole and attempts to break up the convention in a row. I notice that whenever a man finds himself in a very bad place, if he comes from about the isothermal line of my friend from Ohio, he immediately says something about the way in which the South has treated the darky.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into this subject at this time, except to say that we have been accused down South of hanging them and doing all sorts of things with them for all sorts of causes, except for one. Our people, or rather some of our people, have lynched them for rape. So have yours. We never were accused of hanging or shooting them because the poor darkies wanted to make an honest living in the sweat of their brows. We have never shot any of them because they wanted to work, and it seems to me that I have heard of some instances in some Northern States where that was the case. at Pana, Ill., for example, and yet I would by no means indict the people of a great and good and glorious Commonwealth, like Illinois, for example, because some people in it saw fit to shoot darkies because they wanted to work.

Nor would I indict the people of Indiana because I read this in a morning's paper:

#### BOYCOTT OF INOFFENSIVE NEGROES IN INDIANA.

VINCENNES, IND., February 16.

At Wheatland, this county, there is a negro settlement. The negroes work for white farmers. All are quiet and inoffensive, but there is a prejudice against them.

The following notices, signed "Firebugs," were to-day found and have produced a sensation:

"Notice is hereby given that any man who employs negro labor after the 1st of March, or harbors, leases, or rents lands to any negro, their houses will be burned after the 1st day of April."

I do not know whether the extract cited sets forth the truth of an actual happening or not. I hope not. I do know that legislatures confer the privilege of suffrage. I do know that God gives the right to work. Indeed, it is more than a right; it is a duty—obedience to a divine command: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

But the point I intended to get at here—I do not want to enter into the race question further—is this: A motion was made to give ex-Union soldiers a preference in employment. It was moved that ex-Confederate soldiers have the same preference, and the gentleman from Ohio said that he wanted to put the colored man on an "equality," and offered an amendment to the effect that they be put on the same plane as ex-soldiers. I want to demonstrate that whether he intended it or not his proposed amendment was not a motion for equality but for superiority. He put him upon a superior plane, and gave him the preference. The motion was made to give a preference in these appointments to ex-Union soldiers. An amendment was offered to include ex-Confederate soldiers with the ex-Union soldiers.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I correct the gentleman? The law now gives a preference to ex-Union soldiers, and the motion was to extend it to the ex-Confederate soldiers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; that is true. I ought so to have expressed myself. The law now provides that ex-Union soldiers shall have a preference. The motion was then made that ex-Confederate soldiers should share that preference; whereupon the gentleman from Ohio offered an amendment to the amendment to the effect that the colored people should also share it. Share what? Equality? No, preference. In other words, it means that simply because his skin is black a man shall have preference in



these appointments to everybody with a white skin except ex-Union and ex-Confederate soldiers.

Fifty-nine Republicans voted for it. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to discuss the race question. I take it that there is one main difference between the South and the North in regard to the race question. You say we do not let him vote down South, and I say that you do not let him do much of anything else except vote up North. [General laughter and applause.] You say we have sometimes denied him the statutory privilege of suffrage. You have frequently denied him that which is a natural, inalienable, and God-given right, the right to work at any vocation or any honest pursuit. [Loud applause.] [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be out of the way to speak in relation to this bill. [Cries of "Vote!"] Gentlemen say "Vote!" I am endeavoring to talk about this bill. [Cries of "Vote!"] You will not vote until I get through; but that will not be long.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend, and the Committee will please be in order.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, here is a simple proposition made by the gentleman from New Jersey to allow the parties applying for rural routes to ask that that route be let by contract, and when they do so I think it ought to be allowed. I want to call attention to the fact that the State of Colorado could have no rural route at all if we pass this bill saying that the salary shall not go over \$600, for no one could carry the mail for \$600 a year in the mountains of that State.

Were the gentleman from Colorado to send in a petition asking for a route and asking that it be let by contract at a thousand or twelve hundred dollars, it could be established. When I propose to discuss the proposition gentlemen cry "Vote! Vote! Vote!" Now, I ask you to vote, and vote so that Colorado can have a rural route as well as the State of Virginia and other States where the limit of \$600 will not be entirely too low. I am ready for a vote now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey is a very long one.

Mr. SWANSON. It was read about ten minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama object?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object.

Mr. SALMON. It is only necessary to read the first few lines.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask, for the information of the House, that the first few lines be read, so that the House may know what it is. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will wait until the House comes to order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama withdraws his objection to the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey requests that the first few lines of his amendment be read. Is there objection?

A MEMBER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SALMON. I ask for a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 65; yeas 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HILL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill without amendment of the following title:

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Central Railway of West Virginia to build a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Morgantown, in the State of West Virginia.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fourth. That rural free-delivery carriers heretofore appointed and now in the service may be continued as carriers, at a rate of compensation not exceeding \$600 per annum, until such time as the Postmaster-General shall advertise for proposals and make awards for the several routes on which such carriers are now employed.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to this paragraph, which I would like to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That the rural free-delivery carriers provided for in this bill shall not, by any provision or construction of the civil-service law, be included in the classified civil service, any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, upon that point of order there is a provision here that relates to the rural free-delivery carriers heretofore appointed and now in the service, providing that they may be continued in the service at the rate and compensation, etc. This amendment provides that none of these rural free-delivery carriers, whether already appointed or hereafter to be appointed, shall by any construction of the civil-service law be included in the classified service, any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now, this gives the gentlemen who are opposed to the civil-service extension over the rural free-delivery service an opportunity to show where they stand.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is unnecessary to argue to the chairman of the Civil Service Reform Committee that this amendment to the civil-service law is not germane to this section.

Mr. BROMWELL. It is not an amendment to the civil-service law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that this provision is germane to the bill. The only question in the mind of the Chair is whether it is appropriate to this section, inasmuch as this section applies exclusively to a certain class of carriers, but the Chair is inclined to rule, upon the whole, that it is germane and admissible at this point.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any extended remarks on this subject. Gentlemen can see what the object of the amendment is, and I am perfectly willing that debate should be closed upon the paragraph and amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to know whether a substitute would be in order now to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I desire to offer a substitute for the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a substitute the following:

"The laws, rules, and regulations now in force regulating the civil-service status of employees of the city mail-carrier service shall be employed to the employees of the rural free-delivery service, so far as applicable: *Provided, however*, That the carriers shall be selected from applicants living on the mail routes they are to serve, if possible."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have only a very few words to say. We have heard from the beginning of this debate that the country was in danger by reason of this service; that as matter of fact a great many gentlemen almost admitted that it would be better to abolish the rural free-delivery service for fear that these men would raid the Treasury. They had almost reached the point that they were willing to abolish it in order to protect the Treasury. There has been complaint on both sides of this House that this can be used as a partisan service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that the Post-Office Department is the great business system of the Government. I do not pretend to be any great civil-service man in many respects, but I do say that when you come to run a business department that right here is where civil-service laws, rules, and regulations of this country should apply, if they are going to be applied at all. Here is a proposition that goes into the business of every man in the country—goes into the home of every man in the country—and the great question to be considered is whether you are going to have a good service or a bad one.

If these men who hold positions are going to be appointed from a partisan standpoint, if they are going to hold the positions for political purposes, they necessarily can not give the service and the people along their routes as good service as they can if they are entirely free from any partisanship or from partisan politics. Now, if we want to perfect this system, make it a good system, make it serviceable to the people, and at the same time prevent these men from coming here and demanding an increase of salary



by reason of their political services, and not for services they have rendered in the legitimate line of their employment on the part of the Government, we should adopt an amendment putting them under strict civil service or the merit system.

Mr. SWANSON. I simply want to state that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] proposes that the civil-service rules applied to city carriers shall be applied to rural carriers—

A MEMBER. So far as applicable.

Mr. SWANSON. We do not know how that term "so far as applicable" may be construed. Are these carriers to be put under civil-service rules and regulations as now promulgated? The city carrier is not required to live on his route; the city carrier does not cancel stamps; the city carrier does not sell stamps. It would seem to me that the proposed amendment is very unwise, as the two classes of employees are on so different a footing. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. Chairman, after having made a speech myself, I do not like to make a motion for closing debate, and I will not do so; but before taking my seat I wish to move that this section be struck out. I desire that motion to be pending.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall address the House but briefly in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. All gentlemen on the floor have favored the strength and efficiency of this branch of the Post-Office Department. The hope is not extravagant that we may all have it over our districts, so that all our constituents may share in its benefits and its blessings, within a few years.

It will not be as strong as it should be, nor as pure as a government utility, until it is protected by the rules of the merit system, as are the other branches of the civil service.

This amendment secures that result. To you members from Southern districts, to you on the other side who have so eloquently spoken and who look only to the public good, I appeal to you to free forever this branch of the public service from the danger that might come from dragging it into the mire of political use. The South is equally interested. It may be used, and indeed it has been used, by candidates for nominations as the post-office appointments have been used by politicians. It is under a form of civil service rather strict, but this amendment makes it stronger. Let us see the necessity for this provision. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] referred to a press article of this morning that comes to us from Tennessee, and which not only shows the abuse that officers may make of their station, but likewise gives us some notion of the penalty that should be visited on violators of the rules of the merit system. It reads:

[Special to the Washington Post.]

KNOXVILLE, TENN., March 9.

Charges have been preferred against United States Attorney W. D. Wight, Marshal R. W. Austin, of the Second district; Eli C. Skaggs, assistant postmaster at Nashville; John J. Graham, rural route inspector of Campbell County; Rufus Rutherford, postmaster at Clinton, and Caram Acuff, postmaster at Maynardville, by Hon. Horace A. Mann, of this city, for violating rule 2 of the Civil Service Commission and the personal injunction of President Roosevelt that Federal office-holders refrain from engaging prominently in political contests.

The charges were forwarded to Washington Saturday evening, and are expected to reach the capital and be in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, the President, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General Monday morning. Personal appeal also was made to President Roosevelt, and he was urged to send an inspector to Knoxville at once, that the investigations into the charges might immediately be commenced.

The charges are the outcome of a contest in the Second Congressional district for the nomination for Congress.

Let us do our duty. Though we may doubt the expediency of the rules of the merit system, yet we know the value of this service, its great good, the difficulty we have in securing all we want of it for our people, and let us strengthen this arm of the public service by elevating it to the standard at least of the other branches of the Government. Let me appeal to all you Southern members to aid us, by applying the rules of the civil service to it, in all their potency and strength.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that it be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to reading the amendment again?

Objection was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the substitute.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. UNDERWOOD was rejected, there being—ayes 58, noes 104.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the Chair be kind enough to state what is the next proposition upon which we are to vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The next question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FLEMING. Upon that I wish to say a word.

Mr. GROSVENOR ROSE.

Mr. FLEMING. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] if he wishes—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I simply wanted to ask to have the proposition read again. I did not hear it.

Mr. FLEMING. I will wait for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again read.

Objection was made.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment had been read by the Clerk it would have shown to the House that the purpose of the gentleman from Ohio in offering it is to take the entire rural delivery service out of what is known as the civil service or merit system and place it absolutely at the mercy of what we usually call "the spoils system."

Mr. BROMWELL. Just as it has been up to the 1st of February of this year.

Mr. FLEMING. I so understand. The Civil Service Commission, acting under the Executive order, have placed the rural carriers under the protection of the civil-service law. The object of the gentleman from Ohio is to take them out of that law. Now, the gentleman's record as a spoilsman in this House is perhaps sufficient to relieve him from any suspicion of having another motive; yet I can not keep out of my mind the idea that the main object he has in offering this amendment is not to take the rural carriers out of the civil service or merit system so much as it is to load this bill down with an amendment which he knows will compel the President of the United States to veto the bill rather than have it enacted into law.

President Roosevelt, with a courage that does him honor, stood out before the country as an opponent of the infamous "spoils" system when to do so called for backbone in a man; and since he has been placed in the Presidential chair he has still shown that independence and that manhood. It was all that political pressure could do to keep him from vetoing the permanent Census Bureau bill the other day, by reason of an invasion of the rights of the Civil Service Commission, and the custom and practice under that law.

And if this Congress should send to the President this bill with that provision attached to it I have not the shadow of a doubt that he would promptly put his veto upon it; and I charge that that must be one motive of the gentleman from Ohio in offering that amendment.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. FLEMING. I will be glad to have an answer.

Mr. BROMWELL. First let the gentleman conclude, and then I will ask five minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not misinterpret any man's motive, and therefore I do not charge it as a fact, but I say that the gentleman's amendment is plainly subject to that construction, and unless he disclaims the purpose I have a right to make that inference; but whether it be his purpose or not, I say if this House accepts that amendment, such will be the effect of it, and I am not concerned so much with his motives as I am with the effect of the amendment. No friend of this bill, no friend of rural free-delivery service will vote for that amendment with the knowledge before him that its purpose or its effect will be to compel a veto by the Executive.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to deny the statement of the gentleman that I had any such motive as he attributes in offering this amendment. I recognize when I am whipped on the floor of this House as well as anybody. I have advocated earnestly the contract system in this bill. The majority of the House has decided that they do not want the contract system. As a member of the Post-Office Committee, as a member of this House, I feel it my duty to make, as far as possible, this appointive system as nearly perfect as it can be, and I believe it will add to the strength of this system if those carriers are taken out from the classified service in which they have been placed by the Executive order.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, then, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that my amendment only reaches to the carrier. It has nothing to do with this Executive Department in Washington. The clerks, the agents, the inspectors, or the heads of the Departments can have the civil-service blanket placed over them by the President, but it is to the carrier service that my amendment reaches.

In the arguments before this House by the members of the committee and others upon this floor they called attention to the dangers of this present appointive system, so far as their getting in the classified service. There is no reason why these men should be in the classified service, and therefore I have offered this amendment in good faith, for the purpose of perfecting this bill, and if we are to have a system of appointment for the rural free-delivery service, then, I say, it ought to be such a system as we had prior to the issuing of the President's Executive order.



That is all there is in this. Those of you who believe as I do, that you will load down the classified service, if you are friends of it, must know that you are making this rural service inoperative and unsatisfactory, and will have an opportunity of voting for my amendment to save the service; and the friends of civil service, knowing all the circumstances, knowing all the conditions, will have an opportunity of voting against it.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly.

Mr. FLEMING. Has not the President by Executive order already placed these carriers under the civil service, and—

Mr. BROMWELL. My amendment is to take them out.

Mr. FLEMING. And do you not believe that if your amendment is adopted the President would veto this bill?

Mr. BROMWELL. Whether he would or not is a consideration that does not appeal to me at all. I take notice that when the majority of the members of this House passed what they thought was a satisfactory census bill and it went to the White House the President had no scruples against stating his wishes and views in the face of the majority of this House. It seems to me that as a coordinate, independent branch of the Government we ought not to confine ourselves or our action here to what we believe will happen when it gets to the other end of the Avenue. [Applause.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. What do the members of the House now think about the census bill?

Mr. BROMWELL. I know what they are saying in undertones. What they think I do not know. I can give it, but it would be too strong for me to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that I need not confine my remarks to the subject of the civil-service system as it is now organized. I have spoken on the subject of the merit system, a word we used to hear occasionally; but since the passage of the census bill I will not stultify the records of my country by again talking about the merit system, because in that case the great roll of honor that has been created in the Census Bureau has received a black eye from somebody, I do not know exactly who it is. The present attempt to place the civil service over the rural free-delivery system was happily and eloquently illustrated by myself on this floor on a former occasion, at which time I referred to the scientific examination of the horse, the wagon, and the carriage. Nobody has ever answered that speech and nobody ever can. [Laughter.]

But I will not vote for this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I will not do it for this reason: I do not care whether the Civil Service Commission goes on further to illustrate its absurdities by procuring an Executive order to take possession of the rural free delivery or not. The more that organization grasps, the more tyrannical it becomes, the more all-pervading and absorbing it becomes, the sooner the people of the country will destroy it. The more it undertakes to purvey all the political patronage of the United States the more surely will the public in the long run condemn it; but I will not vote for an amendment that says that Congress shall decree that an Executive order, even when made under a misapprehension of the law, shall be disobeyed by anybody. The language of this amendment is—

*Provided, That the rural free-delivery carriers—*

And now I omit a few words that are not necessary to the sense—

shall not be included in the classified service, any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am not willing to vote for that sort of a defiance of the Administration. I was present as a member of Congress when, after the Executive Departments of this Government had been substantially cleaned out of Republicans and unexamined and in many cases unqualified Democrats had been crowded in, the President issued an order covering them all with a blanket.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. BROMWELL. I should like to ask my colleague from Ohio whether if, by unanimous consent, those last three or four words, to which he objects, are stricken out, he would then vote for the amendment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would, most undoubtedly.

Mr. BROMWELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the erasure or omission from the amendment of the words referred to by the gentleman, "any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. SWANSON. I object.

Mr. FLEMING. I object, too, because the President has already issued the order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I believe I have the floor. I was present when that order was issued, which first opened my eyes to the wrong and outrage of the organization of the Civil Service Commission in this town, when the present head of it, who had come

to this town, as I believe, for the sole purpose of producing the result that he certainly did produce, procured that order to be issued, resulting in a condition of the clerical force in this country that has cost this Government more than \$100,000,000 to pay incompetent and worthless clerks.

Mr. HAY. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio by striking out the words "any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the words which he indicates, which will be noted by the Clerk.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that all debate on the paragraph and pending amendments be closed.

The motion of Mr. SWANSON was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words, "any Executive order to the contrary notwithstanding."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BROMWELL), there were—ayes 49, noes 77.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment as a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting:

That any free public library located where the United States Post-Office Department operates a free rural-delivery system shall be, and hereby is, authorized and permitted to send through the United States mails its books, pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines free of postage when addressed to persons who receive mail on any free rural-delivery routes starting from the post-office in the place where the public library is located, and to be delivered by the carriers in precisely the same manner that other second-class mail matter is now delivered. The United States Government shall assume only the same responsibility with reference to the safe delivery of the same as that assumed in the delivery of other second-class matter, and if returned through the mail to be subject to the same postage as second-class matter.

Mr. LOUD. I raise the point of order that it is not germane to the bill before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California raises the point of order that it is not germane. The Chair's first inclination is to rule that way, but will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of the House in discussing the point of order. If the Chair is of that judgment I am willing to submit to the ruling of the Chair, but I desire to say that I differ with the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not suggested any argument which changes the opinion of the Chair. The Chair rules it out of order.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment as an additional section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any carrier in the rural free-delivery service who shall use his official position to promote the interest of any political party or candidate for office shall, upon proof of such fact, be dismissed from the service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this simply provides that any carrier who uses his official position to advance the interest of any political party or any candidate shall, upon proof of such act, be dismissed from the service. If it is adopted, you will not have to go and hunt up the civil-service rules and regulations to see what it means, and you will have the same civil service apply to these carriers whether you have a Democratic or Republican administration. It makes no distinction between Democrats and Republicans or white men and colored men. It treats them all alike. From the statements made by gentlemen on the other side, I am satisfied that the most of them are anxious to vote for it in order to prevent any suspicion whatever attaching to their votes on this question, and I trust gentlemen on this side will give it their support. I am satisfied it is in the interest of good service, and without it you may expect that this branch of the public service in many instances will be used for partisan purposes. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the paragraph offered as an amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Division, Mr. Chairman.



The committee divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 115.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] will act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and tellers reported—ayes 87, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer the amendment that I have already discussed, and I ask the Chair to get order when the amendment is read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding the following new paragraph:

"No person shall be designated as carrier until he files with the Postmaster-General a certificate, signed by a majority of the bona fide patrons of the route, stating that his designation as carrier will not be objectionable to them."

[Cries of "Vote!"]

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, that completes the reading of the bill; and I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House.

Mr. SWANSON. Pending that, if the gentleman will yield for it, I simply want to ask unanimous consent to correct the verbiage of the bill.

Mr. LOUD. I do not yield to any motion or amendment. I will listen to what the gentleman has to state.

Mr. SWANSON. I will state that this is an amendment on page 3 to section 3, which was adopted. The words "Third and that" ought to be left out, so as to make the language exactly correct, to come after the amendment which was on page 2.

Mr. LOUD. I will ask that the Clerk at the desk be instructed to make such verbal correction as may be necessary.

Mr. SWANSON. It is to strike out "Third and that" in the section which was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be allowed to make such verbal correction as is necessary. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the committee rise.

Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to offer an amendment of which I had given notice.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late. The gentleman from California moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. SWANSON. With the amendments as passed in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. With the amendments as passed in the committee.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11728, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to its passage.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SWANSON. To submit a motion generally that the bill be recommitted.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order at this time. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, they will be submitted to the House in gross.

No separate vote was demanded.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to in gross.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with the instructions to bring in the bill with the following as an additional section.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recommit the bill with the instructions which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any carrier in the rural free-delivery service who shall use his official position to promote the interests of any political party or candidate for office shall, upon proof of such fact, be dismissed from the service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recommit the bill with the instructions which have just been reported to the House.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I call for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 140, answered "present" 2, not voting 118, as follows:

#### YEAS—96.

Allen, Ky.	Dougherty,	Lever,	Robinson, Nebr.
Ball, Tex.	Edwards,	Little,	Rucker,
Bartlett,	Finley,	McClellan,	Ryan,
Bell,	Fleming,	McCulloch,	Salmon,
Bellamy,	Fox,	McLain,	Selby,
Boutell,	Gaines, Tenn.	Mahoney,	Shafroth,
Bowie,	Gilbert,	Maynard,	Sims,
Brantley,	Glenn,	Meyer, La.	Slayden,
Bromwell,	Gooch,	Moon,	Small,
Broussard,	Gordon,	Mutchler,	Smith, Ky.
Brundidge,	Green, Pa.	Napfen,	Snook,
Burgess,	Griffith,	Norton,	Spight,
Burleson,	Griggs,	Padgett,	Stark,
Burnett,	Hay,	Patterson, Tenn.	Taylor, Ala.
Burton,	Jackson, Kans.	Randell, Tex.	Thomas, N. C.
Caldwell,	Jones, Va.	Ransdell, La.	Thompson,
Candler,	Kehoe,	Rhea, Ky.	Trimble,
Cassingham,	Kern,	Rhea, Va.	Underwood,
Clayton,	Kitchin, Claude	Richardson, Ala.	White,
Conry,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Richardson, Tenn.	Wiley,
Cowherd,	Kleberg,	Rixey,	Williams, Ill.
Crowley,	Lamb,	Robb,	Williams, Miss.
De Armond,	Lanham,	Robertson, La.	Wilson,
De Graffenreid,	Lessler,	Robinson, Ind.	Zenor.

#### NAYS—140.

Adams,	Draper,	Livingston,	Scott,
Adamson,	Emerson,	Long,	Sherman,
Alexander,	Esch,	Loud,	Showalter,
Allen, Me.	Evans,	Lovering,	Sibley,
Aplin,	Fletcher,	McCleary,	Skiles,
Ball, Del.	Fordney,	McLachlan,	Smith, Ill.
Bates,	Foster, Vt.	Mahon,	Smith, Iowa
Blackburn,	Gardner, N. J.	Marshall,	Smith, H. C.
Blakeney,	Gillett, Mass.	Mercer,	Smith, S. W.
Boreing,	Graft,	Miller,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowersock,	Graham,	Minor,	Southard,
Brick,	Grosvenor,	Mondell,	Southwick,
Brown,	Hamilton,	Moody, Mass.	Sperry,
Brownlow,	Hanbury,	Moody, N. C.	Stewart, N. J.
Bull,	Haskins,	Moody, Oreg.	Sulloway,
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen,	Morrell,	Sutherland,
Burleigh,	Heatwole,	Morris,	Swanson,
Butler, Pa.	Hedge,	Mudd,	Talbert,
Calderhead,	Henry, Conn.	Needham,	Tate,
Capron,	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Tawney,
Conner,	Hildebrandt,	Otjen,	Taylor, Ohio
Corliss,	Hill,	Overstreet,	Thomas, Iowa
Cousins,	Holliday,	Patterson, Pa.	Tirrell,
Cramer,	Hooker,	Payne,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Crumpacker,	Howard,	Pearre,	Tompkins, Ohio
Curtis,	Howell,	Perkins,	Van Voorhis,
Cushman,	Irwin,	Powers, Mass.	Vreeland,
Dahle,	Jack,	Prince,	Wachter,
Dalzell,	Jenkins,	Ray, N. Y.	Wanger,
Darragh,	Jones, Wash.	Reeder,	Warner,
Davidson,	Kluttz,	Reeves,	Warnock,
Dayton,	Kyle,	Roberts,	Watson,
Deemer,	Lacey,	Rumple,	Weeks,
Dick,	Latimer,	Russell,	Woods,
Dovener,	Lewis, Pa.	Schirm,	Young.

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Burkett, Hall.

#### NOT VOTING—118.

Acheson,	Driscoll,	Ketcham,	Pierce,
Babcock,	Eddy,	Knapp,	Polk,
Bankhead,	Elliott,	Knox,	Pou,
Barney,	Feely,	Landis,	Powers, Me.
Bartholdt,	Fitzgerald,	Lassiter,	Pugsley,
Beidler,	Flood,	Lawrence,	Reid,
Belmont,	Foerderer,	Lester,	Ruppert,
Benton,	Foss,	Lewis, Ga.	Scarborough,
Bingham,	Foster, Ill.	Lindsay,	Shackelford,
Bishop,	Fowler,	Littauer,	Shallenberger,
Breazeale,	Gaines, W. Va.	Littlefield,	Shattuc,
Bristow,	Gardner, Mich.	Lloyd,	Shelden,
Burk, Pa.	Gibson,	Loudenslager,	Sheppard,
Butler, Mo.	Gill,	McAndrews,	Snodgrass,
Cannon,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCall,	Sparkman,
Cassel,	Goldfogle,	McDermott,	Steele,
Clark,	Greene, Mass.	McRae,	Stephens, Tex.
Cochran,	Grow,	Maddox,	Stevens, Minn.
Connell,	Hemenway,	Mann,	Stewart, N. Y.
Coombs,	Henry, Miss.	Martin,	Storm,
Cooney,	Henry, Tex.	Metcalf,	Sulzer,
Cooper, Tex.	Hitt,	Mickey,	Thayer,
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins,	Miers, Ind.	Tongue,
Creamer,	Hughes,	Morgan,	Vandiver,
Cummings,	Hull,	Neville,	Wadsworth,
Currier,	Jackson, Md.	Nevin,	Wheeler,
Davey, La.	Jett,	Newlands,	Wooten,
Davis, Fla.	Johnson,	Otey,	Wright.
Dinsmore,	Joy,	Palmer,	
Douglas,	Kahn,	Parker,	

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.



The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Until further notice:

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. HITT with Mr. DINSMORE.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. BURKETT with Mr. SHALLENBERGER.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.

Mr. HULL with Mr. COONEY.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.

For this day:

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. HEMENWAY with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. JOY with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. COOMBS with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. BREAZEALE.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. CREAMER.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Mr. GIBSON with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. GILL with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. LESTER.

Mr. HUGHES with Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. McANDREWS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. MICKEY.

Mr. MARTIN with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. NEWLANDS.

Mr. SHELLEN with Mr. POU.

Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. STEEL with Mr. REID.

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. SHATTUC with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. TONGUE with Mr. NEVILLE.

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. WOOTEN.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I came into the House before the first roll call was finished, but went to my room and finished some work, and when I came back I was told that we were still on the same call. I stepped out again and when I came back I found that my name had been passed. It appears that I was misinformed and that it was the second call and not the first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman was absent when his name was called, and therefore he can not vote.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I was present during the roll call, but just about the time my name was reached a gentleman spoke to me and I did not hear it called.

The SPEAKER. From the gentleman's own statement he can not vote.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote, for I was under the impression that I was paired with Mr. KNOX. I find that Mr. LLOYD, of Missouri, is paired with that gentleman and therefore I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called Mr. BRUNDIDGE's name, and he voted "aye," as above recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I intended to state to the Chair that I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening for his name when it should have been called?

Mr. JOHNSON. I was paying the ordinary attention, but just then a gentleman spoke to me and called my attention away.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was listening to the gentleman who spoke to him and not to the Clerk, and the Chair thinks he can not be allowed to vote on the question.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. LOUD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3830. An act for the relief of William C. Marr; and

H. R. 1198. An act granting a pension to Joshua H. Buckingham.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3090. An act to approve and ratify an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona entitled "An act to provide for the collection, arrangement, and display of the products of the Territory of Arizona at the international exposition to be held at St. Louis in 1903."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SALMON, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BLACKBURN, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COCHRAN, for this day, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Onachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, a statement of cost of manufacture of guns and other articles of manufacture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1901—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4636) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the accounts of Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company for transporting the United States mail, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 796); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 678) for the relief of the heirs of the late Charles P. Culver, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 797); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10142) for the relief of John Donahue, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SCHIRM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 173) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.



Mr. OTEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2559) for the relief of Willis Benefield, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1727) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 801); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 342) for the relief of the heirs of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 802); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10840) granting a pension to Susan Evans Warner, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 803); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1195) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Bridgman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10773) granting a pension to Archer Bartlett, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 805); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2422) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burnham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2802), granting a pension to Martha R. Osbourn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 502) granting a pension to Alexander Beachboard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 750) granting a pension to Martin Essex, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Leland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1706) granting an increase of pension to John E. White, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. McKenny, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6727) granting an increase of pension to Remembrance J. Williams, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 469) granting an increase of pension to Hiram H. Kingsbury, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4543) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2930) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Delany, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4118) for the relief of Charles Maschmeyer, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1135) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stowers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Weimar, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1933) granting a pension to Ella Bailey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1748) granting an increase of pension to Williamanna E. Lynde, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8651) granting a pension to Maggie Helmbold, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7704) granting an increase of pension to Christianna Leach, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3284) granting a pension to Gilbert P. Howe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5888) granting an increase of pension to Peter Pontney, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2394) granting an increase of pension to Sybil F. Hall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 826); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7710) granting a pension to Margaret Scanlon, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 828); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3257) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth K. Prescott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4129) granting an increase of pension to Lonson R. Burr, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 831); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8562) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Vandemark, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 832); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10361) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Scott, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 833); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to



which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3097) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Nunez, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 834); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3238) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 835); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2100) granting an increase of pension to John McGrath, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 836); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1190) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Whittier, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 837); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1139) granting a pension to Abby Clark McNett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 838); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 8) granting a pension to Sarah B. Andrews, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 839); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3054) granting an increase of pension to Alice De K. Shattuck, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 840); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5217) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth P. Sigfried, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 841); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5327) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mackey, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 842); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2947) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Shaw, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 843); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11011) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Tallman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 844); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Annie McElheney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 845); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2867) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hazelton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 846); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2417) granting a pension to James B. Harris, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 847); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1278) granting an increase of pension to La Myra V. Kendig, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 848); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 849); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6805) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Stevens, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 850); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1626) granting an increase of pension to Michael Samelsberger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 851); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4053) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. De Marse, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 852); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3322) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Clough, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 853); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 462) granting an increase of pension to Ann Demonbrun, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 854); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12133) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Todd—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 12272) for the relief of the estate of Jeremiah Simonson, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 962) granting a pension to Rodney W. Anderson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors: A bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 12347) for the relief of honorably discharged officers and privates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS (by request): A bill (H. R. 12348) to prevent the transportation of deleterious food and drinks, and for the establishment of a food bureau in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12349) granting certain privileges to the special policemen stationed at street crossings in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOWLER (by instruction of the majority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency): A bill (H. R. 12350) to maintain the gold standard, provide an elastic currency, equalize the rates of interest throughout the country, and further amend the national banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 12351) amending the act entitled "An act amending section 4708 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to pensions to remarried widows"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (by request): A bill (H. R. 12352) to continue the publication of the American Archives—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 12353) to define renovated butter and to impose a tax upon and to regulate the sale of the same—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 12354) to amend an act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States, approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 12355) to amend section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) providing for an examination and survey of the Missouri River, with a view to improving the navigation thereon between Arrow Rock and the mouth of the Gasconade River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SIMS: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 38) that all employees of the Twelfth Census (laborers, charwomen, enumerators, supervisors, and special field agents excepted) who have not been discharged for incompetency or disreputable conduct



shall be, and they are hereby, made eligible for appointment or transfer to any other department of the Government service at their highest census grades and salaries, the force and effect of this resolution to apply to such census clerks during their employment in the Census Office and for two years after their discharge therefrom—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 39) that the thanks of Congress be presented to Hon. John Hay for the appropriate memorial address delivered by him on the life and services of William McKinley, late President of the United States, on February 27, 1902, and that he be requested to furnish a copy for publication, and that the chairman of the joint committee appointed to carry into effect the resolutions of this Congress in relation to said memorial exercises be requested to communicate to Mr. Hay the foregoing resolution, receive his answer, and present the same to both Houses of Congress—to the Select Committee on the McKinley Memorial Exercises in Memory of the late President, William McKinley.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, favoring Senate bill 1116, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of restraining orders and injunctions in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, urging enactment of Senate bill 1118—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 12356) granting a pension to Washington Ojers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 12357) authorizing the President to revoke the order dismissing from the service Charles W. Franklin, late of Company L, Twentieth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12358) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against James F. Ash, alias James Ashton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 12359) granting a pension to George F. Flinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 12360) for the relief of Miss Eliza A. White—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 12361) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Taver La Rose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 12362) for the relief of C. S. Stilwell, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 12363) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 12364) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12365) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon Stretchbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12366) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wily—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12367) granting an increase of pension to William Danbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12368) increasing the pension of Daniel W. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12369) granting an increase of pension to William Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12370) granting a pension to Ida M. Briggs—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 12371) granting a pension to Reinhardt A. Bausman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 12372) granting an increase of pension to Osmer S. Deming—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 12373) granting a pension to Henry Alexander, of Kahoka, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 12374) for the relief of Mary Cornick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12375) granting an increase of pension to George F. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12376) granting a pension to Manda B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 12377) granting a pension to Capt. Enoch Voyles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12378) granting a pension to Sarah J. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12379) for the relief of John T. O. Wilbar—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12380) for the relief of Isabella Ray McGunnegle, widow of the late Lieut. Commander Wilson McGunnegle, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12381) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Ray McGunnegle—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: A bill (H. R. 12382) granting an increase of pension to William Sands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12383) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of H. C. Haynes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12384) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James L. Northcutt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12385) for the relief of Sophie Kosack—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 12386) granting a pension to Sarah P. Pope—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12387) for the relief of F. E. Rosenkrans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12388) for the relief of Walter Culver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12389) granting a pension to James F. Baker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12390) granting a pension to Henry G. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12391) granting a pension to Benjamin S. Whitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12392) granting a pension to Dellamarr Wade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12393) granting a pension to Abram G. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 12394) granting an increase of pension to Levi Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 12395) granting a pension to Ruth Bartlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 12396) for the relief of Emil J. Pepke—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 12397) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George W. Merry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 12398) for the relief of the estate of Owen Conlen—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution of Boiler Makers and Shipbuilders' Union No. 7, and Pattern Makers' Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., advocating extension of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, for the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of Brewery Workers' Union No. 237, Trunk and Bag Workers' Union No. 1, Bartenders' Union No. 51, Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 11, International Union of Steam Engineers, Electrotypers' Union No. 36, members of Future City Union No. 1, Brewery Oilers and Helpers' Union No. 279, Type Founders' Union No. 5, and Photo-engravers' Union No. 10, all of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 47, of St. Louis, for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, asking for legislation for the protection of our forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, in favor of Senate bill 1791, and of same organization, in favor of a reduction of tariff duties upon Cuban sugar and tobacco, and of reciprocal tariff arrangements with the island of Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of St. Louis Division, No. 2, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, favoring the further restriction of immigration and in favor of House bill 11060, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of editors of German, Bohemian, and Polish newspapers, and several hundred officers of German, Bohemian, and Polish societies, protesting against the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, Business Men's



League, and Manufacturers' Association, of St. Louis, in favor of the Ray bill, to amend the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of William McKinley Post, No. 324, of Sullivan, Mo., and of Barkeepers' Protective and Benevolent Union No. 51, of St. Louis, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Protest of E. W. Waterhouse and 27 other citizens of Bibb County, Ga., against adoption of the contract system in connection with the rural free delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, urging a more rigid restriction of foreign immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Blacksmiths' Union No. 104 and Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., asking for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12357, authorizing the President to revoke the order dismissing from the service Charles W. Franklin, late of Company L, Twentieth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of Washington Post, No. 12, Grand Army of the Republic, Lawrence, Kans., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 6, of Iola, Kans., asking for reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 6, of Iola, Kans., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRICK: Resolution of Post No. 587, Grand Army of the Republic, of San Pierre, Ind., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Shiloh Field Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Elkhart, Ind., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Sheet Metal Workers' Union No. 164, South Bend, Ind., advocating extension of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 379, of Ashland; of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Chippewa Lodge, No. 410, of Abbottsford; of Retail Clerks' International Association, of Marinette, and of Division No. 211, Order of Railway Conductors, of Abbottsford, Wis., favoring the application of an educational test for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 491, of Huron, S. Dak., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 164, of Lincoln, Nebr., and of L. S. Cook Division, No. 389, of Fremont, Nebr., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Railway Conductors' Division No. 227, of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Nebraska Real Estate Dealers, at Fremont, Nebr., in favor of irrigation and land-leasing legislation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 113, of Lincoln, Nebr., in favor of keeping the public domain for homestead purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the National Wholesalers' Shoe Association, in favor of removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the American Chamber of Commerce, of Manila, P. I., in favor of admitting cooly labor into the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the American Paper and Pulp Association, in favor of the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of the arid public domain—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 113, of Lincoln, Nebr., advocating the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Thomas A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of Bricklayers' Union No. 2, of Newport, R. I., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Philadelphia, Pa., against compulsory use of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolution of Bricklayers' Union No. 22, of Danville, Ill., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNELL: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Union No. 1656, of Scranton, Pa., favoring passage of law for exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also resolutions of Garment Workers' Union No. 52, and Stone Cutters' Union, of Scranton, Pa., and Division No. 166, Locomotive Engineers, of Carbondale, Pa., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Bullock Electric Manufacturing Company, regarding House bill 3076—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Union Veteran Legion of Allegheny County, Pa., for the establishment of a Government park on battlefields of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and the Wilderness—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of National Shoe Wholesalers' Association, asking that hides be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brown Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church, Allegheny, Pa., for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolution of Trade and Labor Council of Chillicothe, Ohio, favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Post No. 742, Grand Army of the Republic, Broadwell, Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HASKINS: Resolutions of Typographical Union of Montpelier, Vt., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union of Montpelier, Vt., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HEDGE: Resolution of Division No. 391, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Madison, Iowa, favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Division No. 232, Order of Railway Conductors, Sioux City, Iowa, favoring compulsory education of children and the inspection of factories—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of Division No. 232, Order of Railway Conductors, of Sioux City, Iowa, favoring the bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Division No. 232, Order of Railway Conductors; J. W. Phillips Lodge, No. 104, Moulton, Iowa, and Lake View Lodge, No. 28, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Creston, Iowa, in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of John M. Smith Post, No. 720, Grand Army of the Republic, Mount Morris, Ill., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Petition of Post No. 115, Yellow Springs, Ohio, and Post No. 443, of Felicity, Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union No. 16, of Xenia, Ohio, in relation to the employment of union bricklayers and masons in the erection of the naval dry dock at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Women's Mission Society of the United Presbyterian Church, of Jamestown, Ohio, for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 431, Brazil, Ind., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Bricklayers' Union No. 17 and Carpenters' Union No. 431, of Brazil, Ind., favoring passage of law for exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Resolution of Local Union No. 98, of West Newton, Pa., in favor of House bill No. 9330, for the exclusion of Chinese laborers, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Forest Home Lodge, No. 159, of Derry Station; Carpenters' Union No. 834, of Reynoldsville; Iron Molders' Union No. 386, of Ford City; Brewery Workmen's Union No. 24,



of Dubois, Pa., and Bricklayers' Union No. 27, of New Kensington, Pa., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of General Milroy Post, No. 62, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Washington and Alaska, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolutions of Paradise Lodge, No. 74, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Mountain Lodge, No. 327; E. C. Fellows Lodge, No. 143, Locomotive Firemen; Golden Gate Division, No. 364, Order of Railway Conductors, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 553, Fresno, Cal., favoring bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of San Francisco Lodge, No. 68, Association of Machinists, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of shipowners of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a bill to amend sections 4139 and 4314 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the establishment of a trans-Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the passage of House bill 10375, for the survey and construction of a free public wagon road into the Hetch Hetchy Valley and thence into the Yosemite Valley—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Machine Coopers' Union No. 131 and Bakers and Confectioners' Union No. 24, of San Francisco, Cal., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Granite Cutters' Union No. 1, Cloak Makers' Union No. 8, Sheet Metal Workers' Union No. 104, Bakers and Confectioners' Union No. 24, Pattern Makers' Union, Coopers' Union No. 131, and Engineers' Union No. 59, all of San Francisco, Cal., Coast Seamen's Union, of Eureka, and Machinists' Union No. 5, of Kern County, Cal., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 63, of Ottumwa, Iowa, in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of United Garment Workers of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANHAM: Resolutions of Division No. 177, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Denison, Tex., and of Wagner Lodge, No. 416, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, at Ennis, Tex., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Revival Division, No. 194, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Palestine, Tex., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor bill, defining "conspiracy," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: Papers to accompany House bill 12373, granting a pension to Henry Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of Absaraka, N. Dak., favoring an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Bricklayers' Union No. 3, of Newport News, Va., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Bricklayers' Union No. 3, of Newport News, Va., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Mary Cornick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of various labor organizations in the State of Massachusetts, in favor of restricting immigration from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of citizens of Bloomington, Ind., to accompany House bill granting a pension to Manda B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution of Lookout Division, No. 148, Order of Railway Conductors, Chattanooga, Tenn., asking for the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., with reference to reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, New

York, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 463, of Philadelphia, Pa., advocating the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce of Manila, for the enactment of laws allowing cooly labor to enter the Philippine Islands under such restrictions and laws as the Philippine Commission may enact—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of B. Piccardo, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against a reduction of duty on macaroni and kindred products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, New York, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolution of New England Convention of Brewers, Boston, Mass., for reduction of tax on beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Newspaper Makers' Union No. 1, of Boston, Mass., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: Resolutions of W. A. Rang Lodge, No. 425, and Buckeye Lodge, No. 35, Galion, Ohio; Brotherhood of Locomotive Trainmen; Deer Lick Division, No. 292, Order of Railway Conductors, Chicago, Ill.; Devereaux Division, No. 167, Locomotive Engineers, and Cincinnati Division, No. 107, Order of Railway Conductors, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 57, of Dayton, Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Retail Clerks' Union No. 163; Miami Lodge, No. 273, Dayton, Ohio, and Lodge No. 59, Bucyrus, Ohio, Railroad Trainmen, for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union of Dayton, Ohio, in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of Railroad Trainmen Lodge No. 191, Broom Makers' Union No. 1, Typographical Union No. 23, Pattern Makers' Association, Upholsterers' Union No. 29, and Journeymen Stone Cutters' Union, all of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petitions of Order of Railway Conductors of Terre Haute and Fort Wayne, Ind., and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of Logansport Ind., favoring bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trades disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Order of Railway Conductors of Terre Haute and Michigan City, Ind., asking for the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Terre Haute Division, No. 92, Order of Railway Conductors, in favor of the Foraker-Corliss bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Statements and affidavits to accompany House bill 11934, granting an increase of pension to Condy Manelius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Resolutions of Branch Union No. 9, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of Typographical Union, Cigar Makers' Union No. 65, and Machinists' Lodge No. 471, all of Lynn, Mass., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of George H. Thomas Post, No. 17, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of establishing a United States Army post at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Division No. 138, Order of Railway Conductors, Garrett, Ind., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petition of the Commercial Club, of Omaha, Nebr., and Nebraska Real Estate Dealers' Association, in relation to the leasing of public lands, irrigation, and homesteads—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Union No. 369, of Tonawanda, N. Y., and of Pan-American Division, No. 544, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Buffalo, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Boiler Makers' Union No. 7, and of Cooks'



Alliance No. 66, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Chicago Butchers and Grocers' Association, favoring the passage of the Mann pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Commercial Club of Omaha, for irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., with reference to reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SELBY: Resolution of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association No. 2, of Alton, Ill., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill 11641, granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Loewenstine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of citizens of Bradford and Custer, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill 1637, granting an increase of pension to John A. Spalding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Colonel Myran Barker Post, No. 33, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Carpenters' Union No. 651, of Jackson, Mich., for restriction of immigration, etc.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of New Haven Pressmen's Union, for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of Brick Makers' Benevolent Association No. 1, St. Paul, Minn., asking for the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Petition of Barbers' Union No. 168, of Oneonta, N. Y., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Boise City Typographical Union, No. 271, of Idaho, against the passage of bills amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of William F. Robertson, of Lawrence County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George W. Taylor, trustee of estate of E. H. Metcalf, deceased, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Granite Cutters' Union and Stone Masons' Union No. 29, of Worcester, Mass., relative to admission of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 92, of Worcester, Mass., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolutions of Coopers' Union of Townsend, Carpenters' Union of Leominster, Barbers' Union of Fitchburg, and Firemens' Union No. 94, of Waltham, Mass., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 109, of Dunkirk, N. Y., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Bricklayers' Union No. 24, of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the continued exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of Iron Molders' Union of Quakertown, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Perkasio Home, No. 33, B. U. (H. F.), of Pennsylvania, for a national military park at Valley Forge, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of International Bricklayers' Union No. 54, of Norristown, Pa., in favor of excluding Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Women's Suffrage Association of Montgomery County, Pa.; of the Village Improvement Association of Doylestown, Pa.; of the Century Club of Pottston, Pa., and of the Langhorne Sorosis Club, for a national forest reserve in the Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Southern Tier Division, No. 10, Order of Railway Conductors, for the enactment of the Foraker-Corliss bill, amending the law relating to safety appliances—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Iron Molders' Union of Port Huron, Mich., asking for a further restoration of the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of Retail Clerks' Union No. 55, Sacramento, Cal., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the California Miners' Association, San Francisco, Cal., for the establishment of a national department of mining, the chief officer of which shall be a member of the President's Cabinet—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of George Ridlen Post, No. 275, of Scottsburg, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 11, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 65) to provide for the employment of extra clerical force in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 9332) to authorize the Dothan, Hartford and Florida Railway Company to construct a bridge across the East St. Andrews Bay, navigable water, at a point about 1 mile east of Farmdale, in the State of Florida;

A bill (H. R. 10305) to amend section 14 of the act approved June 29, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River;"

A bill (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation to employees thereof; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) granting permission for the erection of a monument or statue in Washington City, D. C., in honor of the late Benjamin F. Stephenson, founder of the Grand Army of the Republic.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 3090) to approve and ratify an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, entitled "An act to provide for the collection, arrangement, and display of the products of the Territory of Arizona at the international exposition to be held at St. Louis in 1903;" and

A bill (H. R. 199) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the congregation of the Morning Star Baptist Church, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution in the Southern States; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Cooperative Creamery Association, of Montague, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of Lowell, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Cambridge; of the City of Homes Union, No. 622, of Springfield; of Paper Makers' Local Union No. 19, of Fitchburg, and of Boot and Shoe Workers' Local Union No. 259, of Stockton, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Interstate Irrigation Congress, held at Sterling, Colo., relative to the adoption of a plan for the disposal of the public lands and for the irrigation thereof; which were ordered to lie on the table.